




3 1761 07444131 2



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of Toronto





69 (53)

RANDOM RECOLLECTIONS

OF

THE HOUSE OF LORDS,

FROM

THE YEAR 1830 TO 1836,

INCLUDING

PERSONAL SKETCHES OF THE LEADING MEMBERS.

BY

THE AUTHOR OF

“RANDOM RECOLLECTIONS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.”

L. B. ...

Third Edition.

LONDON :

SMITH, ELDER, & CO., CORNHILL.

1836.



JN
623
1836
G82

LONDON:
BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS,
WHITEFRIARS.

P R E F A C E.



THE almost unprecedented success which the Author's work on the other House of Parliament has met with, has naturally induced him to lay the present volume before the public. He hopes it will, not only from the nature of the subject, but from the spirit in which it has been written, be found a suitable companion to "Random Recollections of the House of Commons." His great object has been to preserve the strictest impartiality in his various Sketches, and he trusts he has, in this respect, been successful. He also hopes the volume will be found fully as interesting as his work on the other House of Parliament.

In a volume embracing so great a variety of

facts, it is possible some slight inaccuracies may be discovered; but the Author hopes that these will not only be found unimportant in their character, but few in number.

London, March 28, 1836.

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
PREFACE	iii
CHAPTER I.	
THE HOUSE	1
CHAPTER II.	
FORMS, RULES, REGULATIONS, &c. OF THE HOUSE	9
CHAPTER III.	
MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS	36
CHAPTER IV.	
SCENES IN THE HOUSE	53
CHAPTER V.	
LATE MEMBERS	70
Lord King—Lord Suffield.	

CHAPTER VI.

	PAGE
TORY PARTY—DUKES	79
Duke of Cumberland—Duke of Wellington—Duke of Gordon—Duke of Newcastle—Duke of Buckingham—Duke of Northumberland—Duke of Buccleugh.	

CHAPTER VII.

TORY PARTY—MARQUISES	107
The Marquis of Londonderry—The Marquis of Wellesley—The Marquis of Salisbury.	

CHAPTER VIII.

TORY PARTY—EARLS	119
Earl of Eldon—Earl of Wicklow—Earl of Limerick—Earl of Winchilsea—Earl Roden—Earl of Aberdeen—Earl of Haddington—Earl of Harrowby—Earl of Rosslyn—Earl of Mansfield.	

CHAPTER IX.

TORY PARTY—BARONS	161
Lord Wynford—Lord Lyndhurst—Lord Ellenborough—Lord Fitzgerald and Vessey—Lord Ashburton—Lord Abinger—Lord Wharnccliffe—Lord Kenyon.	

CHAPTER X.

PEERS WHO HAVE SEATS IN THE CABINET	204
Lord Melbourne—The Marquis of Lansdowne—Lord Holland—Lord Duncannon.	

CHAPTER XI.

	PAGE
LIBERAL PARTY—DUKES	236
Duke of Sussex—Duke of Leinster—Duke of Sutherland —Duke of Cleveland.	

CHAPTER XII.

LIBERAL PARTY—MARQUISES	247
The Marquis of Westminster—The Marquis of Anglesea —The Marquis of Clanricarde—The Marquis of Co- nyngnam.	

CHAPTER XIII.

LIBERAL PARTY—EARLS	259
Earl Grey—Earl of Durham—Earl of Radnor—Earl of Carnarvon—Earl Mulgrave—Earl of Burlington—Earl Fife—Earl Fitzwilliam.	

CHAPTER XIV.

LIBERAL PARTY—BARONS	314
Lord Brougham—Lord Plunkett—Lord Denman—Lord Cottenham—Lord Langdale—Lord Hatherton—Lord Teynham.	

CHAPTER XV.

NEUTRAL PEERS	362
The Duke of Richmond—The Earl of Ripon.	

CHAPTER XVI.

	PAGE
LORDS SPIRITUAL	375

The Archbishop of Canterbury—The Archbishop of Dublin—The Bishop of Exeter—The Bishop of London—The Bishop of Durham—The Bishop of Hereford.

CHAPTER XVII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS	406
------------------------------	-----

RANDOM RECOLLECTIONS,

&c. &c.

CHAPTER I.

THE HOUSE.

IN accordance with the plan I adopted in my work on the other House of Parliament *, I begin this volume with some account of the interior of the building in which the Lords assembled for their legislative deliberations prior to its partial destruction by the great fire of October, 1834. That edifice, as is generally known, has been repaired for the accommodation of the Commons at an expense of upwards of 30,000*l.* It is generally supposed that it was originally the Banquet Hall attached to the royal residence; but that on the erection of Westminster Hall, it was converted into the Court of Requests, in which the King received the petitions of his subjects. It was afterwards, but at

* "Random Recollections of the House of Commons."

what precise period is not known, appropriated to the use of the Lords. At the union of Great Britain and Ireland, in 1800, it was enlarged and repaired, and put into that condition in which it was found at the time of the late destructive fire.

The interior of the late House of Lords formed a large and spacious chamber. Its length from south to north was eighty feet, and its breadth from east to west, forty feet. The height from the floor to the ceiling was about thirty feet. The place was well lighted by three semi-circular windows on each side. The windows were about six feet in height, and their tops were only about one foot below the ceiling. The walls beneath were all hung with tapestry of the richest kind, divided into compartments: the last of the tapestries which had been made to decorate the walls of the House were the most superb. They consisted of representations of the dispersion of the Spanish Armada in the year 1588, and were presented by the States of Holland to Queen Elizabeth, in testimony of their admiration of the consummate skill and bravery of the English fleet on that occasion. On the borders of these tapestries were medallion portraits of the various officers belonging to the English fleet at that period. These curious and valuable tapestries were all destroyed by the fire of 1834.

At the southern or upper end of the House was placed the King's throne, which was fitted up in 1820 ; it was a splendid and costly piece of furniture. It consisted of a large canopy of crimson velvet, surmounted by an imperial crown : it was supported by richly gilded columns, ornamented with oak leaves and acorns. Their pedestals were decorated with olive branches, and other figures emblematic of the glory of Great Britain. It was always kept covered, except when occupied by the King, or when bills were about to receive the royal assent by commission. It was elevated about three feet above the floor of the House, and was ascended by three carpeted steps. In front was a brass railing to prevent any other person than the King himself approaching it. Outside of this railing, on either side of the throne, the Members of the House of Commons and other distinguished persons were allowed to stand to witness the proceedings of the House *. At the northern end, or that farthest from the throne, was the bar of the House, where Members of the House of Commons who had messages to deliver to the Lords made their appearance, and where they might, on any occasion, stand during the debates. Other persons were also privi-

* These observations will be understood as equally applicable to the present House.

leged to stand outside the bar while the business was proceeding, provided they had been taken into the House by a Peer. The bar was capable of accommodating from one hundred and forty to one hundred and fifty persons in a standing position; with which position they were, indeed, obliged to be content, for no seats were provided for them. During very interesting debates, the space at the bar and the space on either side of the throne exhibited a living mass of human beings.

Immediately before the throne was the Woolsack, on which the Lord Chancellor sat during the proceedings of the House. It consisted of a sort of sack, made, as the name implies, of wool, and was covered over with a piece of crimson cloth. The woolsack was about six feet in length, two and a half in breadth, and about twenty inches in height. It must have been irksome for the Lord Chancellor to sit for any length of time on the woolsack, as there was nothing against which to rest or support his back. The woolsack extended across the House. Before it were two other woolsacks, about the same size, extending lengthwise, on which the Judges, the King's Counsel, and Masters in Chancery sat, during the proceedings. On the left hand side of the House, from the throne, were the Opposition benches, at present tenanted by the Con-

servatives; and on the right were those of Ministers and their supporters. The Lords Spiritual had four benches to themselves, on the right of the throne. These benches were each about ten or twelve feet in length, and were detached from the others. The benches ran in tiers along the House, from the throne to the bar. The tiers were four in number; the first being for dukes, the second for marquises, the third for earls, and the fourth for viscounts and barons. This point of etiquette was not very often observed. Peers of different ranks, from the highest to the lowest, sat promiscuously together. The first row of benches was only three or four feet from the sacks on which the Judges sat. At the furthest end of these sacks was the table of the House, where the clerks sat and took notes of the proceedings. On the table were two boxes, for the reception of petitions and other documents which may have been presented to their lordships, and which were ordered, as the technical phrase is, "to lie on the table." Between the table and the bar were several cross-benches, which were occupied by Peers who did not identify themselves with either the Liberal or Tory party, but who adopted a middle course. It was on these benches that the Duke of Richmond and the Earl of Ripon took their places when they seceded from the Ministry of Earl Grey. These noblemen occupy the

same seats in the present House. The front row of benches on the right of the throne immediately fronting the sacks on which the Judges sat, was always, as in the House of Commons, occupied by Ministers; that on the left, directly opposite, was the place on which the leading Opposition Peers sat. All the seats were padded and covered over with crimson cloth.

On the left of the bar was a door which communicated with the House of Commons: at this door the members of the latter entered when they had any message to the Lords; and their Lordships, when proceeding to the Painted Chamber to hold a conference with the Commons, always went out at the same door. On the right was a door leading to various committee rooms; and at the north end of the House was another door, at which strangers entered, when introduced by Peers.

Immediately above the bar was a gallery for the public and the press. It consisted of four seats, and was capable of accommodating about one hundred persons. The front seat was appropriated exclusively to the reporters. The others were for the public indiscriminately, who had procured Peers' orders—the only means of admission. Half-a-crown will procure any one admittance to the gallery of the House of Commons. Fifty pounds will not effect the same object in the gallery of the

House of Lords. Gentlemen and others, not knowing the existence of the rule—or not aware of its strict enforcement—have, on various occasions, offered considerable sums for permission to enter; but the decided manner in which the first offer has been refused, has always prevented a second. It was only on the occasion of the trial of Queen Caroline, in 1820, that the gallery of the House of Lords was erected. Previous to that time, strangers stood below the bar; and there the reporters, at great inconvenience, took their notes of the speeches of the members of the House. Some four or five years ago, a small part of the gallery was, by means of a division, allotted exclusively to the ladies. It was only capable of accommodating about twenty with any degree of comfort. On all important occasions it was well filled, chiefly by the immediate relations of Peers. In the gallery of the present House there is not, owing to its limited size, any place for the ladies; but it is understood they will not be forgotten in the arrangement of the new House.

In speaking of the gallery of the House of Lords, it would be unpardonable to omit the mention of the remarkably obliging disposition, and urbanity of manner, invariably shown towards all who have occasion to be in it, by Mr. Maggs, who

is entrusted now, as he was in the old edifice, with the care of that part of the House. Strangers, when visiting other places sometimes experience uncivil treatment from the officers; but any one who has been in the gallery of the House of Lords must have quitted it with a grateful sense of the kind and polite deportment of Mr. Maggs.

On the right of the throne was a door at which the King entered when he visited the House. On the left was the door at which the Peers entered. The door on the right led to a room appropriated to the King, for dressing in, and for other purposes. That on the left led to an apartment belonging to the Lord Chancellor.

The present House is a small narrow apartment. Last year it was but very imperfectly lighted, and had altogether a very sombre appearance. It is more cheerful now, owing to the new windows added to it during the recess. It is incapable of containing more than two hundred and fifty of their lordships with any degree of comfort. It is right to mention, however, that it is but seldom a greater number are present, and it is not often there are so many. It is unnecessary to repeat, that what has been said respecting the arrangement of the old House equally applies to that of the present.

CHAPTER II.

FORMS, RULES, REGULATIONS, &c., OF THE HOUSE.

THE opening either of a new Parliament, or of a new Session of Parliament when the latter is opened by the King in person, is a very imposing spectacle. The former is always done by the King in person, except under very extraordinary circumstances. The interior of the House on such occasions presents a most interesting sight.

The ceremony usually commences at a quarter past two in the afternoon. As early as twelve there is always a large attendance of Peeresses, Peeresses' daughters, and other female members of the aristocracy, all in full dress. The attendance of Peers on such occasions is usually limited; their absence is chiefly owing to a wish to accommodate the ladies with their seats. The number of ladies generally present when the King opens a new Parliament, or a new Session of Parliament, in person, is from two to three hundred. Notwithstanding the extremely unfavourable state of the weather on

the opening of the present Session, the number of female members of the aristocracy could not have been much under two hundred and fifty. As the present House is of such very limited dimensions, a considerable number found it impossible to procure comfortable seats in the body of the House, and therefore stationed themselves in the two side galleries which extend along that part of the House nearest the throne. The scene, altogether, when the King arrived, was one of unusual splendour. In the side galleries, as just mentioned, and along the two first rows of benches on either side of the floor, with the exception of the Ministerial bench, and that occupied by the leaders of the Opposition,—the ladies were ranged, arrayed in their most splendid apparel; while the other parts of the House were occupied by the Peers, the Foreign Ambassadors, and other distinguished persons from every court in the world maintaining at the present time a friendly understanding with this country. The Peers were all clothed in the robes of state peculiar to their respective ranks. The Foreign Ambassadors, and the other distinguished persons from foreign courts, were also dressed in the court costume of their different countries. The Foreign Ambassadors have a place allotted to themselves on the seats immediately behind Ministers.

Between the Ministerial bench and the right of the throne, are, as observed in the previous chapter, the seats appropriated to the Lords Spiritual, on which the Bishops sat, dressed in full canonicals. Outside the bar were the members of the House of Commons, headed by their Speaker. The gallery for strangers was on this, as on all similar occasions, shut to the public. Peers' orders, which on other occasions command the instant admission of those who are fortunate enough to procure them, always go for nothing when the King opens Parliament in person; and also, indeed, when it is opened by commission. Nothing but the signed and sealed order of the Lord Great Chamberlain will prove a passport to any one. The select character of the company, even in the strangers' gallery, on such occasions, may, therefore, be at once inferred. The parties consist in a great measure of the male relatives or friends of Peers.

As on all similar occasions, the firing of cannon announced the arrival of his Majesty outside the House. In a few minutes after, the flourishing of a trumpet intimated that he was on the eve of making his entrance. The Peers all rose; the King made his appearance and advanced to the throne. He seated himself on it, and then desired

the Lords to resume their seats. When he is absent they usually sit with their hats on their heads; when he is present they are all uncovered as a mark of respect to him. Shortly after, when the necessary arrangements were completed, and every one who had taken part in the forms was in his proper place, the speech, written out, as it invariably is, in large legible penmanship, on two or three folio sheets of paper, was put into his hands. He instantly, after looking first at the Lords, who were all in the immediate vicinity of the throne, and then at the Commons outside the bar, commenced reading the speech. A breathless calm ensued, which was preserved to the close.

I may here be allowed to make a slight digression, while I endeavour to give a sketch of his Majesty, interspersed with some further observations respecting the opening of the present Session of Parliament.

In person the King is about the middle height. He can scarcely be said to be corpulent, but his stoutness approaches to it. His shoulders are rather high, and of unusual breadth. His neck has consequently an appearance of being shorter than it is in reality. He walks with a quick but short step. He is not a good walker. I know of no phrase which could more strikingly characterise his

mode of walking, than to say—"he waddles." The latter is not a very classical term, but in the present case it is peculiarly expressive. His face is round and full. His complexion is something between dark and sallow. What the colour of his hair is I cannot positively say, as on every occasion on which I have seen him he had either the crown or a hat on his head. As far as I could form a judgment it is of a light brown. His features are small and not very strongly marked, considering his advanced age. His nose is short and broad, rather than otherwise. His forehead is pretty ample both in breadth and height, but has a flatness about it which deprives it of any intellectual expression. His large light-grey eyes are quick in their movements, and clear and piercing in their glances. His countenance is highly indicative of good nature blended with bluntness. You see nothing either in his appearance or manners that would lead you to infer that he was other than a plain country gentleman. That he is goodhearted and unaffectedly simple in his demeanour, is a fact of which you are convinced the very first glance you get of him. The beadle of a parish, when clothed in his cloak of office, struts about at the church door with an air of immeasurably greater self-importance than William the Fourth exhibits when he meets

in state the Nobles and Commoners of the land. You cannot help thinking that he wishes in his heart he could either dispense with the prescriptive ceremonies he has to go through at the opening and closing of each Session, or that in the overflowing kindness of his soul, he forgets at the time he is the Sovereign of these realms. His every look and movement furnish evidence, not to be mistaken, of the man triumphing over the Monarch. It is clearly with difficulty that, in the midst of the procession to the throne, he restrains himself from suddenly stepping aside to shake hands with every nobleman he sees around him. As it is—contrary to the usual practice of Kings on such occasions—he nods, and evidently says in his own mind, “How do you do?” to every Peer he passes. Of his extreme good nature and simplicity of manners he gave several striking proofs at the opening of the present Session. The day was unusually gloomy, which, added to an imperfection in his visual organs consequent on advanced years, and to the darkness of the present House of Lords, especially in the place where the throne is situated,—rendered it impossible for him to read the Royal Speech with facility. Most patiently and goodnatureedly did he struggle with the task, often hesitating, sometimes mistaking, and at others correcting himself. On one

occasion he stuck altogether, when, after two or three ineffectual efforts to make out the word, he was obliged to give it up, when turning to Lord Melbourne, who stood on his right hand, and looking him most significantly in the face, he said, in a tone sufficiently loud to be audible in all parts of the House, “ Eh! what is it?” The infinite good-nature and bluntness with which the question was put, would have reconciled the most inveterate republican to monarchy in England, so long as it is embodied in the person of William the Fourth. Lord Melbourne having whispered the obstructing word, the King proceeded to toil through the speech, but by the time he got to about the middle, the Librarian brought him two wax tapers, on which he suddenly paused, and raising his head, and looking at the Lords and Commons, he addressed them on the spur of the moment in a perfectly distinct voice, and without the least embarrassment or the mistake of a single word, in these terms :—

“ My Lords and Gentlemen,

“ I have hitherto not been able, from want of light, to read this speech in the way its importance deserves ; but, as lights are now brought me,

I will read it again from the commencement, and in a way which, I trust, will command your attention."

He then again, though evidently fatigued by the difficulty of reading in the first instance, began at the beginning, and read through the speech in a manner which would have done credit to any professor of elocution,—though it was clear he laboured under a slight hoarseness, caused most probably by cold. The sparkling of the diamonds in the crown, owing to the reflection caused by the lighted candles, had a fine effect. Probably this was the first occasion on which a King of England ever read his speech by candlelight, at the opening of his Parliament.

Shakspeare lays it down as a maxim—"Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown." In this Shakspeare is wrong. It is no doubt true as a general rule, but it does not admit of universal application. Had Shakspeare lived in the reign of William the Fourth, he would never have penned the observation in the unqualified way in which it stands. He would have seen in the person of our present Sovereign an exception to the rule. *His* head does not lie uneasily. The Crown sits lightly on it. Not that he is indifferent about the welfare of his subjects; far from it; but because he believes that

they live under a mild and paternal and enlightened Government, and that, conscious of nothing but the most kindly feelings towards them, he never allows his mind to be haunted for one moment with any suspicion of their loyalty to his person or fidelity to his throne. It is one of the irresistible tendencies of his nature to look on the sunny side of the picture; in this case his unsuspecting disposition will not betray him into any error. The generous confidence he reposes in the friendly feelings of his subjects towards him, is not misplaced. Few monarchs have reigned more in the affections of his subjects than does William the Fourth of England.

What I have said respecting the opening of the present Session applies in the main to the opening of every Session when the King is personally present. When he is absent the opening takes place by commission, the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, reading his speech from the woolsack.

On the meeting of a new Parliament, after the delivery of the King's speech, the first thing done is that of the Lord Chancellor, or Keeper of the Great Seal, taking the oaths and subscribing the declarations, as prescribed by various Acts of the Legislature. The certificate of the clerk of the

crown respecting the sixteen Peers elected to serve in Parliament for Scotland* is next read, after which all the Peers present take the oaths, and subscribe the declaration in the same manner as the Lord Chancellor. When this is done some bill is read *pro formâ*, on which the Lord Chancellor reports his Majesty's Speech from the Throne. The Committee of Privileges is next appointed, after which the House adjourns to the same day as the House of Commons. At the beginning of every other Session of the same Parliament, after prayers are said, the same forms are gone through, with the exception of taking the oaths and subscribing the declaration. Any Peer voting before he has taken the oaths, renders his whole property liable to forfeiture. Peers who expect to be absent during the whole or part of the sitting of the new Parliament must be present to name their proxies; otherwise they cannot vote by proxy.

At the next meeting of their Lordships, which, at the commencement of a new Parliament, usually takes place in five or six days after the delivery of the King's speech, they take that speech into their consideration in the same way as in the other

* The twenty-eight Irish Representative Peers are chosen for life.

House*. At the opening of a new Session, the House only adjourns for a few hours. Though an amendment is usually moved to the answer to the King's Address,—it is chiefly done for the purpose of affording a better opportunity for the expression of the opinions of the opponents of Government, and not with the fixed determination of pressing the House to a division on the subject.

Before proceeding to business, prayers are read on every succeeding day during the session, by the junior bishop. The House usually meets at ten o'clock, when some law Lords and two or three Peers sit for the purpose of hearing cases of appeal. The House generally closes the hearing of appeals at three o'clock, and adjourns to five, when it again assembles for the purpose of legislating on the business of the nation.

As the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal is, by virtue of his office, Speaker of the House, the Lords have not, like the Commons, on the meeting of every new Parliament to choose a Speaker; but in the event of his absence (and also that of any other Peer authorised by the King to supply that place, on any occasion,) from the House,

* More ample information on this subject will be found in "Random Recollections of the House of Commons."

the Lords have a right to choose their own Speaker until his return. This right, however, never becomes the subject of party contest, one of the two Deputy Speakers being always present to take the seat of the absent Lord Chancellor.

It is unnecessary to say, that the Lord Chancellor sits on the woolsack during the proceedings of the House. His Lordship, when on the woolsack, is always clothed in his robes of office as a Law Judge. The Great Seal and Mace always lie before him. When his Lordship rises to speak, he must quit the woolsack and take the place to which he is entitled according to his rank as a Peer. He has a right to speak on any subject that comes before the House, and so far possesses a privilege which is denied to the Speaker of the House of Commons.

A certain number of the Judges, Masters of Chancery, and of the King's Privy Council, are always summoned by writ to be in attendance during the sitting of each Parliament. They are not permitted to sit among the Peers, but, as before stated, have two seats resembling the woolsack in the middle of the floor for themselves. The Peers usually sit with their hats on, but the Judges and King's Council must sit uncovered. They are not permitted to speak on any subject, or under any

circumstances until they are formally required to do so ; even then, if any noble Lord opposes their speaking, the question that leave be granted them to speak, must be first decided in the affirmative by a majority of the House.

In the House of Lords, instead of a Peer addressing himself to the Lord Chancellor, as the members of the other House do to the Speaker, he must address himself to the Lords generally.

As regards the frequency of speaking, the same regulations are observed as in the Lower House. No Member is allowed to speak a second time on any question, except it be in the way of explanation, or when the Peer who made the motion wishes to reply. This applies to the proceedings when their Lordships are sitting as a House ; when in Committee, they may speak as often as they think proper. No noble Lord must, on any occasion, or under any circumstances, mention the name or title of any other noble Lord. If he wishes to refer to any particular Peer, he must do so in some such phraseology as the following—“The noble Duke,” or “the noble Marquis who has just sat down,” “the noble Earl, at the head of his Majesty’s Government,” “the noble and learned Lord,” “the noble Lord that spoke last,”

“the noble Viscount who spoke last but one,” “the noble Baron who spoke last but two,” &c. &c.

In conducting bills through the House, nearly the same order is observed as in the Commons. Though there is no specific rule or regulation against opposing a bill on its first reading, there is a conventional understanding among the Members that no opposition be offered to any measure at that stage of the proceedings. Nor is any measure, except in very peculiar circumstances, opposed on its third reading. The opposition, debate, and division, are always expected to take place on the second reading. The first and third readings are concurred in as a matter of course.

When the measure to be introduced is one of great importance, and likely to lead to a warm and lengthened discussion, the usual practice is to ask leave to bring in the bill. The Peer, who asks such permission of the House, prefaces his motion to that effect by an ample statement of the provisions of the intended measure, with the grounds on which he rests its alleged necessity or expediency. The motion for this permission is almost invariably assented to, those who may be expected to be opposed to it, urging as their reason for acquiescing in its introduction, that, as it is not

before them, they cannot be expected to give any decided opinion on its merits, and adding that they reserve any opposition they may have to offer to it until it is regularly before them, and they have had time duly to examine its provisions.

When a bill has been read a second time, the next thing to be done is to move that it be committed. This is always assented to by the opposing Peers as a matter of course, because they know that the same majority that carried the second reading of the bill, would inevitably carry its committal. If the measure be one of great and general importance, it is referred to the consideration of a Committee of the whole House: if only of limited or local interest, it is referred to a Select Committee.

In Committees of the whole House, the various clauses of a measure are read seriatim, in order that any noble Lord, should he feel so inclined, may have an opportunity of proposing either the entire omission of particular clauses or some amendment to them. On those clauses which recognise leading principles, or which, in other words, may be said to embody the principle of the measure, a discussion takes place, which is often as ample and animated as on the second reading of the bill. The only differences in the two cases are, that when in

Committee the Lord Chancellor does not sit on the woolsack, but has his place supplied by the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Chairman of Committees,—that every member may speak as often as he pleases,—and that no proxies are allowed to vote.

In Select Committees, which consist only of ten or fifteen, or some other limited number of Peers, the sittings are always in an apartment up stairs, or some other apartment adjoining the House. When on these occasions one member addresses the other members of the Committee he must do so uncovered, but he may remain in his seat, if he please, all the time he is addressing them.

When a bill has gone through Committee, a report of the alterations or alleged amendments which have been made in its provisions, is read to the House, and it is for the House to reject or adopt those alleged amendments, as it thinks proper; or it may adopt part and reject the remainder. On bringing up the report on measures of importance, I have often seen very warm discussions arise, though a division takes place but seldom at that stage of a bill. When the report of the Committee is read and approved of, the bill is ordered to stand for a third reading on a given day, but it cannot take place on the day on which the report is brought up. When the bill is read

a third time the question is immediately put by the Lord Chancellor, that it do pass, which is always acquiesced in as a matter of course. If the measure originated with the Lords themselves, it is sent down to the Commons by a deputation, usually consisting of two Masters in Chancery. No Peer can, under any circumstances, be sent to the House of Commons, as that would be deemed derogatory to the character of their Lordships. The bill has, in the supposed case, to go through essentially the same forms in the Lower House as if it had originated there. The nature of these forms I have described in "Random Recollections of the House of Commons." When the measure has passed the Lower House, it is returned to the Lords, in order that they may accept or reject the alterations or amendments, or any part of them, which have been made on it. If they approve of the alterations made, the bill is engrossed or written fairly out on parchment, and is immediately sent to the King to receive the Royal Assent, on which it becomes the law of the land. But if the King refuse his signature to it, as George the Third did in the case of the Catholic Emancipation Bill of 1806, it necessarily falls to the ground. The way in which the King intimates his determination not to give his assent to the measure, is not by a positive

refusal in so many words; he simply observes, in answer to the application made to him for that purpose, "*Le Roi s'avisera*," namely, "The King will consider of it," which is understood to be a final determination not to sanction the measure. When the Royal Assent is given to any measure—which it can be in bills requiring haste without the King's presence, by executing a Commission for the purpose to some of his nobles—the clerk of the Parliament intimates the circumstance to their Lordships,—the clerk of the Crown having previously read the title of the bill. If the bill be a public one, the answer is, "*Le Roi le veut*," viz., "The King wills it so to be." If a private bill, the answer is, "*Soit fait comme il est désiré*," namely, "Let it be as it is desired." If the bill relates to sums of money granted to his Majesty, it must be carried up and presented by the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Lords having nothing to do with money matters. The answer of the King to such bills is, "*Le Roi remercie ses loyaux sujets, accepte leur benevolence, et aussi le veut*,"—which means that "The King thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and wills it so to be."

If the Lords refuse to acquiesce in any alterations which the other House may have made in a measure sent down by them, a conference is

demand, which used to take place in the Painted Chamber before the late destructive fire, but which is now held in another adjoining apartment. The conference consists of certain members deputed by each house. The Lords sit covered at a table, while the Commons must stand uncovered during the conversational discourse that takes place on the points in dispute. If the two Houses cannot come to an understanding together, the business is at an end, and the measure falls to the ground. The same observation equally applies to bills which have originated in the other House and been sent up to their Lordships, should the alterations, under the name of amendments, made by the latter, not receive the sanction of the former. Bills sent up by the Commons for the sanction of their Lordships are immediately returned, should no alteration be proposed, with the words written on them, "Soit baille aux Communes." All bills sent up by the Commons have to go through substantially the same forms as those which originate in the Lords.

When a bill is sent up by the Commons to the Lords, the member bearing it is usually accompanied by a number of other members. The object in this is to show the respect which the Lower House entertains towards the Peers. The Usher

of the Lords announces this deputation in these words, "My Lords, a message from the Commons," when the Lord Chancellor desires the persons bearing it to be brought in. As the Member of the Commons who carries the bill advances on these occasions towards the bar of the House of Lords, he makes three low bows, and addressing himself to the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper, who, with the Great Seal* before him, advances to the

* There is nothing of which one hears so frequently, or of which so little is known, as the Great Seal. The statement, so often made in giving an account of the proceedings in the Upper House, of the Lord Chancellor carrying it before him, is altogether a fiction. His Lordship merely carries before him the bag in which it is deposited when he receives it from the King, or when, on his retirement from office, he delivers it up into his Majesty's hands. This bag is embroidered with tassels of gold, silver, and silk, beautifully worked together. His Majesty's arms are on both sides. The bag is about twelve inches square. The Great Seal is made of silver, and measures seven inches in diameter. It is in two parts, and is attached to the letters patent by a ribbon or slip of parchment inserted at the bottom of the instrument through a slit made for the purpose. The ends of the ribbon or parchment are put into the Seal, and the wax is poured into an orifice left at the top of the Seal for the purpose. The Seal is one inch and a half thick when fixed to receive the wax. The impression of the Seal is exactly six inches in diameter, and three quarters of an inch in thickness.

The obverse represents the King on horseback, habited in a flowing mantle, holding a marshal's baton in his right

bar to receive the bill,—he says, “ The Commons have passed an act intituled, &c., to which they desire your Lordships’ concurrence.” As he makes the observation he hands the bill to the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, who receives it with a nod, and returns to the woolsack. The member presenting it, and those who accompany him, then retire from the bar, making the same reverences as when they advanced to it, and return to their own House. The Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, on reaching the woolsack reads aloud, so as to be heard by all the other Peers, the title of the bill sent up to their House. The same ceremony is gone through on the bringing up of

hand ; in the back ground is a ship in full sail, surrounded with the legend *Gulielmus Quartus Dei Gratia Britanniarum Rex. Fidei Defensor* : under the foreground of the figure is a trident within a wreath of oak. The reverse represents the King crowned, and in his coronation robes, holding the sceptre and mound seated in St. Edward’s Chair ; on his right hand is Britannia, Peace, and Plenty ; on his left Neptune holding his trident, Religion and Faith ; over the head of the King are the Arms of England surrounded with palm leaves, and under his feet a caduceus, the whole within a border of oak leaves and acorns. On every new accession to the throne a new Seal is struck, and the old one is cut into four pieces and deposited in the Tower. The die for the present Seal was struck by Mr. Benjamin Wyon, and is allowed on all hands to be unrivalled as a work of art.

every bill, though fifteen or twenty should be brought up at once.

It is not requisite in the Lords, as in the Commons, that forty, or any considerable number of members be present before commencing business. If the Lord Chancellor, two other temporal Peers, and a Bishop are present, it will suffice. I have often seen the business begun when the number of members in the House did not exceed ten or twelve, and on many occasions on which no questions of importance were expected to come before their Lordships, I have known the evening's sitting concluded without numbering twenty Peers.

There is a rule or regulation in the House of Lords, precisely the same as that in the Commons, prohibiting the bringing forward of the same measure more than once during the same Session.

The mode of taking the votes in the House of Lords is very different from that adopted in the Commons. The manner of taking the votes in the Lower House will be found detailed at length in the work to which I have already more than once referred. In the Upper House the members give their votes beginning at the lowest baron, and proceeding seriatim to the Peers highest in rank. Every one answers by himself, "Content," or "Not Content," according as he is friendly or opposed to the

measure before the House. If the numbers should chance to be equal, it is invariably presumed that the House is against the bill, so that the "Not Contents," or its opponents, succeed as completely in defeating it as if they had a majority of twenty to one. While the votes are being taken every one remains in his place, but when they are all taken, the "Contents" go below the bar, while the "Not Contents," remain within the bar.

Ministers and their adherents sit, as in the House of Commons, on the benches on the right side of the House, and the Opposition on the left. The disproportion between the Tories and Liberals is so great in the Lords, that when a change of Ministry, and a consequent change of places by the two parties occurs, the comparative emptiness of the benches formerly crowded, and the crowded state of those formerly so empty, has a curious appearance to the eye of one in the habit of attending the House.

It is only, as in the House of Commons, by sufferance, that the newspapers publish the proceedings in the House of Lords. There is an express standing order against any such publication. Of course it is equally contrary to the orders of the House that strangers should be present during the debates. The practice of excluding them

during the time a division takes place, is still observed in the Upper as well as in the Lower House.

The House of Lords, like that of the Commons, usually adjourns from day to day, except on Fridays, when it adjourns till Monday. At Easter, however, both Houses adjourn for nearly a fortnight, and, if it appear proper to the members, they may adjourn either of the Houses for any period they think proper. When Sir Robert Peel's Administration was dissolved in April last year, both Houses were adjourned for a month, in order that time might be afforded to the members of the Ministry, in the Commons, to be re-elected, and the Administration consolidated. An adjournment, however long, makes no alteration in the state of measures before the House; on its again meeting they are taken up at the particular stage in which they were left. It is different when a prorogation takes place. All bills and measures, however far advanced through the House, fall as much to the ground as if they had never been before it. The King has no right to adjourn the Lords*. It can only be done by the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, with the consent of the House; but his Majesty can, whenever he

* These observations equally apply to the Lower House.

pleases, prorogue the House, and therefore his private wish, on any occasion, for an adjournment, has only to be known to be complied with. Both Houses usually, but not always, adjourn at the same times and for the same periods; but the one has no influence over the other in this or in any other respect. The King may order Parliament to adjourn to any place he pleases. It is a mistake to suppose it must always meet at Westminster.

I stated in a former part of this chapter that the Lords have nothing to do with money bills in the way of making any alteration in them, but that they must either accept or reject them as sent up to them by the House of Commons. If a bill, however, pertaining to money, be mixed up with other matters in the form of one bill, the money clauses may be expunged, and the other part of the bill be preserved. An instance occurred last Session in the case of the Church of Ireland Bill. Their Lordships having no objection to the Tithes Bill, but being, on the contrary, friendly to it, concurred in the clauses which related to it, while, on the motion of an Opposition Peer, no fewer than thirty-two clauses bearing on the appropriation of the property of the Church to other than ecclesiastical purposes, were expunged. As Ministers, however, declined to proceed with the Tithes Bill detached from the appro-

priation measure, the former of course fell to the ground.

It is not necessary that the Speaker be a Peer of the realm. On different occasions one of the Judges, not a Peer, has, when there happened to be no Lord Chancellor at the time, and the Keeper of the Great Seal has been absent,—presided on the woolsack; but in such cases he has, of course, no vote. In the Session of 1835, Sir William Pepys, Master of the Rolls, though only a member of the House of Commons, occupied the woolsack for several weeks during the absence of Lord Denman, who was then engaged in the performance of his judicial duties at the country assizes.

Strangers in the gallery, as in the House of Commons, are always ordered out when a division is about to take place; but the moment it is over, they are re-admitted. Members of the Commons never go to the stranger's gallery, but stand outside the bar, or in the open space outside the throne.

I have already stated, that the House usually sits in its judicial capacity from ten o'clock in the morning till three in the afternoon. The public are then admitted without a Peer's order. The gallery, however, is not open on such occasions: the

public stand outside the bar. The number of Peers present, during the transaction of judicial business, seldom exceeds six or seven, usually consisting of three or four of the Judges, and two or three other Peers.

The Peers have a right to call for the assistance of Counsel, when any measure which they think requires such aid is before the House. The latest instances in which they have employed Counsel, were in the case of the Stafford Election Bribery business in the Session of 1834, and in that of the Municipal Corporation Reform Bill, last Session. The Counsel on such occasions stand outside the bar, from which place they examine witnesses and address their Lordships.

When any question of very great importance is to be brought before the House, any Peer has the right of compelling the attendance of the other Peers. The method adopted in this case is, to issue a circular to each Peer, requiring his presence on the day fixed on, which is synonymous with a call of the House in the other branch of the legislature.

CHAPTER III.

MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS.

IN the foregoing chapter I have mentioned the leading rules, regulations, &c., of the House, with some of the privileges of the Peers. There are a great many other forms and observances of minor importance enjoined in the standing orders of the House, but only a part of them is attended to. It is a standing order of the House, as previously mentioned, that no part of the proceedings of the House be published, and consequently every newspaper in the kingdom is daily and weekly guilty of an infraction of that order, as are the Peers themselves in openly countenancing it. Another order not very strictly adhered to, is that which enjoins every Peer to sit in the place which he is entitled to occupy in virtue of his relative rank. One standing order never enforced is, that every Lord who enters the House after prayers shall be fined according to his rank. If he be a Baron or a Bishop, the penalty is to be one shilling; and “if any degree

above," he is to be fined two shillings. Every Lord who does not go to the House at all, and renders no admissible excuse for his absence, is to be subject to a fine of five shillings. The penalties thus exacted are ordered to be given to the poor. Were this order strictly enforced, the paucity of attendance at the time of prayers, and the emptiness of the benches sometimes for weeks in succession, would prove the source of no inconsiderable revenue to the poor. Another of the standing orders which are daily violated is, that which prohibits any Peer from entering the House of Commons without first obtaining leave from the House of which he is a member. The truth is, that the standing orders of the House are so numerous, and embrace such a variety of points, that it were matter of as much difficulty rigidly to observe them as most people, whose business is exclusively with the Excise, find it to be to keep its laws. The standing orders amount in number to no fewer than two hundred and thirteen.

Every one who has had an opportunity of observing the proceedings in both Houses, must have been struck with the decided superiority of the Upper over the Lower House in regard to the talent, order, and good taste displayed in debating on public questions.

Observations to this effect are invariably made by those who have been present during debates in both Houses; and they have generally expressed their surprise at the circumstance. It appears to me that nothing could be more capable of easy explanation. In the first place, the Peers being hereditary, and once in the Upper House remaining there for life, have, in the great majority of cases, been members for a long course of years, and, consequently, have all the advantage of experience in regard to its proceedings over the other branch of the legislature. Then, again, the greater part of them have the further advantage of having been drilled into habits of public speaking and transacting public business, by a sort of apprenticeship in the House of Commons. And how much long practice sharpens the faculties of the mind, as well as in most cases improves the manner of public speaking, must be known to every body who has ever thought on the subject. The Commons have no such advantages: a great number of the members of that House retire at every general election,—not to mention the changes which take place in the representation of the country in the interval; while their places are supplied by raw country gentlemen, and persons who know nothing of public business or public speaking,—many of whom perhaps never

were in the House in their lives. To school such persons into a knowledge of the rules and forms of the House, requires, in many cases, a period of some years. But this is not all. In the House of Commons, the members being responsible to their constituents, and liable to be dismissed on the recurrence of every new general election, are often, for the sake of retaining their good opinion, obliged to make speeches whether Nature has intended them for public speaking or not; and often, too, on particular subjects with which they are but very imperfectly acquainted. Indifferent exhibitions on the floor of the Lower House must, in many cases, be the result of this disagreeable necessity. In the Upper House, the members are more fortunately circumstanced. Responsible to no constituency or person, and certain of their seats for life, unless they commit any serious crime against the State, they are perfectly free to act as they choose—to make a speech or maintain an unbroken silence, just as they feel inclined.

The scenes of confusion so common in the other House, are of very rare occurrence in the Lords. In the latter place one's ears are never assailed by the zoological sounds so frequently to be heard in the Lower House. The art of cock-crowing has yet to be learned by the

Peers; nor have any of their Lordships yet afforded evidence of possessing the enviable acquirement of braying like a certain long-eared animal, yelping like a dog, or mewling like the feline creation. You hear no sounds in the Upper House resembling those emitted by a Scotch bag-pipe or an Italian hand-organ. There are no ventriloquists there: if you wish to see exhibitions, and hear sounds of this description, you must descend to the Lower House, where you cannot fail to form a very exalted opinion of the talents of the principal performers.

In the Lords, the triumphant party never even cheer, in the usual acceptation of the term, however great the victory they have achieved over their opponents. The announcement of the result of every division is heard in unbroken silence. In the course of the debates—however high party feeling may run on each side of the question—you never witness any other demonstration of that feeling than in an occasional ‘Hear, hear!’ Or it may be, your ears are greeted with cries of ‘Order, order!’ from the opposite side, when any member is transgressing, or is supposed to be transgressing, the rules of the House, either as regards the respect due to some Peer individually, or to the House in its collective capacity. You

are struck with the gravity which usually characterises the proceedings in the Upper House. The contrast will appear particularly striking if you have been in the other House in some of its more noisy and uproarious moods. The gravity, indeed, of the proceedings in the Lords, often verges on dulness: still you cannot fail to be struck with the superior talents and business habits of their Lordships.

There is one thing which goes far to account for the superior gravity and order which characterise the proceedings of the hereditary branch of the legislature, apart from the influence which their Lordships' own notions of dignity have in producing those effects. I allude to the circumstance of the disparity in the number of members in each House. Though the number of members in the House of Lords is only about a third less than the number of members of the other House, the attendance on important occasions in the latter place, is usually nearly three times as great as that in the Lords. The system of voting by proxy in the Upper House, while no such system exists in the Lower, accounts for this. It is unnecessary to add, that whenever business is transacted, or any question discussed, either by large or small assemblages, there must of necessity be much more

order and regularity of proceeding in the latter than in the former case.

You will never on any occasion, from the commencement to the close of a session, observe any of the Peers lying horizontally on the seats,—which is so general a practice in the other House. They have too high a sense of their own dignity for that. Neither do you, with two exceptions, ever see any of them somnolent. The exceptions I refer to are a Ministerial Duke and a member of the Right Rev. Bench of Bishops. His Grace has not been very regular in his attendance of late: formerly he was very exemplary in his legislative conduct in so far as his presence and his votes were concerned; but he never heard a word of the debates. No matter how important the question, or who were the speakers,—there he sat firmly locked in the arms of Morpheus, with his head half buried in his breast. He always sat, as Milton would have said, “apart by himself.” What is worthy of observation is, that he was most regular in his attendance when there was no subject of importance before the House; and when, consequently, the benches were comparatively empty. If there was one bench on his side of the House which was unoccupied, on it he was sure to seat himself. The Right Rev. Prelate to whom I refer, has not quite

so strong a disposition to somnolency : he only addresses himself to sleep occasionally during the proceedings ; but when he does so, there is no mistake about the matter. Soundly and well does he sleep. Nothing will awake him until he has had his nap out. Not even the thunders of Lord Brougham's eloquence, when in his most violent and impassioned moods, have the slightest effect in the way of disturbing the Right Rev. Prelate's slumbers. While the Lord Chancellor, in the debate on the Irish Tithes Bill, in August, 1834, was causing the walls of the House to resound with the fierce invectives he hurled "at all and sundry" opposed to Ministers, and especially at the devoted head of the Earl of Mansfield,—the Right Rev. Bishop slept as "sweetly" as if his Lordship had only been singing a lullaby. The zest with which he enjoys a stolen slumber appears to be so great, that he must often, on awaking, have cordially concurred with Sancho Panza in invoking a thousand blessings on the head of him who invented sleep. In fact, the profoundness of his slumbers seems to be in proportion to the loudness of the tones of the speaker. How profound, if this hypothesis be a correct one, would be his Reverence's repose in the immediate vicinity of the Falls of Niagara ! Byron loved the ocean's roar. The roar of this mighty

cataract would be "most sweet music" to the Right Rev. Prelate's ears.

Though the House of Lords meets and is prorogued contemporaneously with that of the Commons, and though, like the Commons, it sits almost every evening during the session, Saturdays excepted, I doubt whether its sederunts, taken in the aggregate, occupy a sixth part of the time consumed in the sittings of the Commons. Sometimes the average duration of their Lordships' sittings will not, for five or six consecutive weeks, exceed an hour each evening. In the course of a whole session, they do not perhaps sit till nine o'clock above twenty times; not till twelve, six times; and not till two, above once or twice.

There are seldom more than twenty or thirty Peers present, except when some unusually important business is before the House. The place and proceedings are consequently on such occasions extremely dull and uninteresting.

Though the Lords have the same right of introducing any measure they think proper, except money bills, as the Commons, they have not of late years availed themselves of their privilege to any great extent. They have allowed the other House to introduce most of the measures which have passed the Legislature for some years past. Mr.

Hume and other members of the Commons have complained of this, as throwing all the burden of legislation on the representatives of the people. It is understood that the Upper House is, in future, to take a more active part in introducing measures into Parliament.

The House of Lords consists of three Peers of the Blood Royal, all of whom are, as a matter of course, dukes; of twenty-one other dukes; nineteen marquises; one hundred and ten earls; eighteen viscounts; one hundred and eighty-two barons; sixteen representative Peers of Scotland; twenty-eight representative Peers of Ireland; twenty-six English Bishops, and four Irish Bishops; making in all four hundred and twenty-seven members.

The title of Duke was originally synonymous with that of the leader of an army. It is derived from the Latin word "Dux," which signifies a leader or general. The first person created a duke was Edward the Black Prince. His father, Edward the Third, conferred on him the title of Duke of Cornwall; a title which, though afterwards merged in the principality of Wales, has ever since been possessed by the heir apparent to the crown. The celebrated Henry Plantagenet was the second personage who enjoyed the title. Dukedoms were

not, however, hereditary at this period; they were only conferred, with the exception of the princes of the blood royal, on those who had distinguished themselves in the field of battle. The general impression is, that they did not become hereditary until the beginning of the seventeenth century. In 1572, the title was entirely extinct. It was revived by James the First, in the person of the celebrated George Villiers.

A duke's parliamentary robes are made of fine scarlet cloth, lined with white taffeta, with four guards of ermine on each side; each guard is surmounted by gold lace, and the robe itself is tied up to the left shoulder by a white riband. His cap consists of crimson velvet, lined and turned up with ermine, with a gold tassel on the top. It is only, however, on occasions of ceremony that a duke uses his robes. His coronation robes are different. Formerly dukes were created by cincture of sword, mantle of state, the imposition of caps and coronets of gold upon their heads, and the putting of verges of gold into their hand. This ceremony always took place in open parliament, and was observed so late as the reign of James the First. Dukes are now created by letters patent from the King. A duke's eldest son is usually, by courtesy, called marquis, and the other sons are called lords.

The King, when addressing them officially, styles them his “ Right trusty and right entirely beloved cousins and councillors.”

Marquises were first created in the fourteenth century. The first person on whom the dignity was conferred was Robert De Vere. He was created Marquis of Dublin in 1386 by Richard the Second. Another creation took place in the same reign ; from which time the title is supposed to have been extinct until the reign of Edward the Sixth. It was revived by that monarch merely as an ensign of honour, and soon became a regular grade of nobility. Marquises are created by letters patent from the King. Their eldest sons are called earls from courtesy ; but neither they nor the sons of dukes are entitled to a seat in the House of Peers, nor to any of the privileges of nobility. The state robes of a marquis differ but slightly from those of a duke. The King calls him his “ Right trusty and entirely beloved cousin.”

The most ancient of the several titles belonging to the peerage of this country, is that of Earl. When the dignity was first conferred is not known ; but it is supposed to be as ancient as the time of the Roman sway in Britain. It was originally, in every case, attached to the possession, or government, or both together, of some large tract or division of

land, now known by the name of county or shire. An earl in former times was entrusted with the sole administration of justice, joined to a military command, in the district in which he resided. His powers were similar to those of the present governors-general of our colonies. In the course of time the dignity was conferred by letters patent from the King, and earls ceased to exercise, in virtue of their title, this extensive jurisdiction. As these titles became more general, they were not confined, as formerly, to counties, but extended to towns, villages, estates, and, in a few instances, even to surnames. The difference in their robes of state from those of dukes and marquises, is but very trifling. When addressed officially, the King styles them his "Right trusty and right-well beloved cousins."

The first creation of a Viscount took place in the year 1440, by Henry the Sixth, who conferred the dignity on John Beaumont by letters patent. The title has ever since been bestowed in the same way. Before the time of Henry the Sixth, the term viscount was applied to all the deputies of earls, or sheriffs of counties, but it did not invest the possessor with any rank of nobility. His robes differ from the robes of the higher orders of nobility, in being less richly ornamented. The King officially

styles them his “Right trusty and well-beloved cousins.”

The title of Baron was first conferred by William of Normandy on his leading followers, as a reward for their services, when he conquered England. To the dignity, there was in every instance attached a certain portion of land, called a lordship or barony, the extent of which was proportioned to the importance of the services which William's more distinguished followers had respectively rendered him. The title, and all the privileges annexed to it, descend from father to son. Like the other orders of nobility, it is now created by letters patent from the King, and all heiresses of Barons can have their titles and privileges secured to them only by the same means. In the official addresses of the King, Barons are called “Right trusty and well-beloved.” The difference between their Parliamentary and Coronation costume and that of Viscounts, is so small as to be unworthy of notice.

As the Lords Spiritual are so much of a class by themselves, I mention them last. Had I adhered to the orders of rank, however, I could not have done so. The Archbishops take precedence of all other ranks of the peerage, with the single exception of the Royal Dukes. The Bishops take their rank between Viscounts and Barons. This

rank was assigned to them by a special Act of Parliament in the thirty-first year of the reign of Henry the Eighth. The Bishop of Sodor and Man has no seat in Parliament. The reason assigned for this is, the circumstance of his being appointed to that see by the Duke of Athol. The other Bishops hold their seats, not in virtue of anything in their ecclesiastical position, but in virtue of certain baronies annexed by the Crown to their respective sees. The Irish Bishops sit in the House of Lords by rotation. The cycle by which they regulate their admission into the House is so arranged that each Archbishop sits once in every four, and each Bishop once in every six sessions. The Lords Spiritual vote on all questions except on trials for high treason, or other cases of a criminal nature. They deem it inconsistent with their ecclesiastical character to take any part in proceedings of this kind, and therefore always absent themselves from the House on such occasions.

The Lords have various powers and privileges peculiar to themselves. They are the sole judges in the arraignment of any Peer of the realm—in the impeachment of any Minister of the Crown—of Writs of Error relative to illegal proceedings in the Courts of Law—and in Appeals from the Courts of Chancery. In all matters of import-

ance, such as those which pertain to the corruption of Judges or Magistrates, or other persons filling judicial or civil situations of responsibility, they can, whenever they please, put persons on their oaths. All bills in any way affecting the rights of the Peers must originate in their own House, and cannot be altered in the slightest degree by the House of Commons. Every Peer has a right to enter his protest on the Journals of the House against any measure of which he disapproves, and to state the reasons on which he grounds his dissent at any length he pleases. When sitting in judgment, the Peers do not give their decisions on oath as do the Members of the House of Commons, but simply on their honour. They are regarded by the Constitution as the hereditary counsellors of the King, and may, at any time, demand admittance to his presence to give him their advice on any question they consider important. Their persons are for ever sacred in the eye of the law; they cannot be imprisoned or arrested for debt, nor can they be outlawed in any civil action. Any person circulating scandalous reports respecting a Peer, no matter whether true or false, subjects himself to fine and imprisonment. Their houses cannot be entered under any circumstances, by the officers of justice, without a warrant under the King's own hand, and under the

hands of six Privy Councillors, four of whom must be Peers of the Realm. They have the right of qualifying a certain number of chaplains to perform divine service. The number, however, varies with the rank of the Peers. A Duke can qualify six; a Marquis or Earl, five; a Viscount, four; and a Baron, three. These are the leading powers and privileges of the Peers. They have various others of minor importance.

CHAPTER IV.

SCENES IN THE HOUSE.

SCENES of confusion and uproar are of comparatively rare occurrence in the Upper House. In the Commons they are almost regarded as matters of course. I have sometimes seen six or seven decidedly rich ones, in the Lower House, in the course of one debate. In the Lords there is not, on an average, the same number in the course of a session. Were the Marquis of Londonderry and Lord Brougham absent, I believe an entire session might pass over without one; for I have scarcely seen any thing worthy of the name of a scene occur in the House for the last few years without either or both of these noblemen taking a conspicuous part in it. One very extraordinary scene occurred in April, 1831, on occasion of the King's dissolving Parliament. Not having been in the House while this extraordinary scene was being enacted, I am not able to describe it from

my own observation, but must take the account as it appeared in *The Times* newspaper of the following day, making such slight alterations in it as are necessary in converting it from the third to the first person.

Their Lordships met at three o'clock. The House was crowded in every part. The Lord Chancellor having, as was understood, left the Woolsack for the purpose of receiving his Majesty, whose arrival had been announced by the firing of the Park guns, and the cheers of the multitude assembled outside the House,

The Earl of Mansfield rose and said:—I move that the Earl of Shaftesbury do take the chair *pro tempore*.

The Earl of Shaftesbury took his seat on the Woolsack.

Lord Wharncliffe.—I believe there can be no doubt on your Lordships' minds as to the purpose for which we have this day met.

The Duke of Richmond rose amidst the greatest confusion.—I rise to order. Some noble Lords are not in their places. I move the standing order of the House, that they do take their places.

A noble Lord.—I dissent from the suggestion of the noble Duke.

The Duke of Richmond.—I maintain it is a

standing order of the House that noble Lords take their proper places on such an occasion as the present, and if that order be not complied with, I will move another standing order, "That persons not members of the House be ordered to withdraw."

The scene of confusion which here ensued defies description. A number of Peers, in all parts of the House, were calling out "Order, order," at the full stretch of their voices, while the Peeresses who were present—of whom there were many in full dress—were greatly alarmed. In the midst of the scene a noble Lord, supposed to be Lord Lyndhurst, made some observations which were not heard.

The Duke of Richmond.—I have to complain of the use of such language as that which has just fallen from the noble Lord; and I shall move that the standing order against offensive language be read. (Renewed uproar, which it is impossible to describe.)

When it had somewhat subsided,

The Marquis of Londonderry's voice was heard. He spoke in a very loud tone, and exhibited the utmost violence of manner. He said—I rise to order. I maintain that I am in possession of the House. I rise to accuse the noble Duke of bringing forward a very unfounded charge. I am not aware of any offensive language being used on this

side of the House which could provoke the remarks of the noble Duke.

The Marquis of Clanricarde.—After what has fallen from the noble Marquis, it is most desirable that the noble Duke should persist in his motion for the observance of the standing orders of the House.

The Marquis of Londonderry —I call on the noble Duke to mention any offensive language which has been used by the noble Baron (Lord Lyndhurst). It appears to me that the noble Duke begins to think that he is to be the hero of the *coup de état* on this occasion, and that he fancies he can smother that feeling which is essential to the expression of the sentiments of noble Lords on this most extraordinary meeting. It appears to me that the noble Duke is endeavouring to set aside the right of Peers to declare their sentiments, by having recourse to so miserable an expedient as that of moving the standing orders of the House.

The cries of “Order, order,” which now resounded through the House, were deafening. They were mingled with shouts of “Order of the Day,” during which

Lord Wharncliffe rose and said—Without wishing to provoke a discussion on the subject, I am anxious that it shall be entered on the Journals

of the House, that I, in my place yesterday, did give notice that I would move an humble Address to his Majesty, not to exercise his undoubted prerogative of dissolving Parliament. I now beg leave to read the address to your Lordships.

The noble Lord here read the Address, which was to the effect, that it appeared to the House, that under the extraordinary circumstances in which the country was placed, and the excitement then existing in the public mind, a prorogation or dissolution of Parliament was likely to be attended with the most disastrous consequences. (Loud cries of "Hear, hear," from the Tory benches.)

The Lord Chancellor at this moment entered the House, and addressed their Lordships in the most emphatic manner in the following terms:—"My Lords, I have never yet heard it doubted that the King possesses the prerogative of dissolving Parliament at pleasure; still less have I ever known a doubt to exist on the subject at a moment when the Lower House has thought fit to refuse the supplies."

Here there were tumultuous cries of "Hear, hear," mingled with shouts of "The King, the King," and tremendous uproar.

The Lord Chancellor having retired from the House to receive his Majesty.

The Marquis of Londonderry called on Lord Shaftesbury to take the chair. (Cries of "Order, order," "Lord Shaftesbury," "Shame, shame," "The King," and the greatest uproar.)

The Earl of Shaftesbury having taken his seat on the Woolsack, a scene of confusion ensued, of which it were impossible for words to convey any idea. When it had partially subsided,

The Marquis of Londonderry rose, with much warmth of tone and violence of gesture, and said,—
"As long as I hold a seat in this House, I will never consent to" — (The uproar was here renewed with such tremendous violence as to prevent the noble Marquis from proceeding farther.) It having again partially subsided,

The Earl of Mansfield rose and said,—My Lords, such a scene as this I never before witnessed in your Lordships' House, and hope I never shall see any thing like it again. I have heard from the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack, with the utmost surprise, that it is the undoubted right of the Crown to dissolve Parliament when the House of Commons refuses the supplies. The noble and learned Lord had indeed, perhaps with wilful ignorance, declared this to be the fact. I will use no intemperate language; but I will nevertheless assert, as far as God Almighty has given me the

means of understanding, that the Crown and the country are now about to be placed in a most awful predicament, unparalleled at any previous period. The noble Earl was proceeding in somewhat the same strain, when loud cries of "The King, the King," announced the approach of his Majesty, who, on entering, immediately mounted the throne, with a firm step, and begging their Lordships to be seated, he, after one or two forms had been gone through, delivered his speech, dissolving the Parliament.

The Times' account of this extraordinary scene concludes thus:—"It is utterly impossible to describe the scene that presented itself in the House, from the commencement of the proceedings up to the very moment of his Majesty's entrance. The violent tones and gestures of noble Lords—the excitement, breaking down the constitutional usages, not to say civilities of life, astonished the spectators, and affected the ladies who were present with visible alarm. In a word, nothing like this scene was ever before witnessed within the walls of Parliament."

The next scene which I shall give took place in July, 1834. It arose out of certain explanations which noble Lords, members of Lord Melbourne's government, were giving at the time, respecting

the course which Ministers meant to pursue relative to the Coercion Bill for Ireland,—Lord Grey having a few days before retired from office. I was present during the scene, and took notes of it at the time. The Duke of Buckingham, after violently attacking Government, concluded his speech as follows:—“The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack seems very desirous of correcting the speeches of other noble Lords. I tell him to recollect his own speeches on this subject, and correct himself. (Loud cheers from the Opposition.) The hon. and learned Member for Dublin may now be said to be sole Governor of Ireland. (“Hear, hear.”) The noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack (Lord Brougham) and his colleagues think they have buried the noble Earl (Grey) in his political sepulchre, and that he will no more disturb them, but they will find themselves mistaken. The spirit of the noble Earl will burst its cerements, and will haunt them in their festivities, and disturb the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack in the midst of his ‘potations pottle deep.’” A scene of confusion and uproar, which it is impossible to describe, followed the conclusion of the Duke of Buckingham’s speech, in the midst of which

The Marquis of Lansdowne and Lord Brougham

both rose at the same time to address their Lordships, but the former gave way.

Lord Brougham, (labouring under great excitement, and addressing his first sentence to the Marquis of Lansdowne,) said—"Stop a minute! As to the concluding observations of the noble Duke, all I shall say is, that I do not frequent the same cabaret or ale-house as he does. (Deafening cries of "Order, order.") At all events, I do not recollect (continued Lord Brougham, with increased energy,) having met the noble Marquis (Londonderry) at the noble Duke's ale-house potations. My Lords, I have not a slang dictionary at hand"—

Here a whole host of noble Lords rose, amidst deafening uproar, to address the House. The first voice heard distinctly was that of

The Marquis of Bute.—I rise to order. The noble and learned Lord is completely out of order.

Several other noble Lords shouted "Order, order," at the same time.

The Duke of Buckingham,—(with a look of ineffable self complacency, and evident enjoyment of the scene,) I wish the noble and learned Lord to proceed.

Lord Brougham remained for some time on his

legs as if desirous of proceeding, but the confusion and noise in all parts of the House were so great as to render any effort to obtain a hearing altogether hopeless. The shouts of "Order, order," from both sides, were absolutely deafening. Lord Brougham at last resumed his seat, without uttering a word.

The Marquis of Bute.—I rise to order, not only from respect to this House, but from respect to both the noble Lords themselves, as it is likely they may, in the heat of the moment, give utterance to language which they would afterwards regret. I am sure they will both see that it is with the most friendly feeling towards them that I wish to put an end to this altercation.

Lord Brougham.—The noble Marquis would have been more deserving of my thanks if he had allowed me to sit down, which I was just about to do at the time, without interfering at all. With regard to the concluding observation of the noble Duke—

The Marquis of Londonderry.—I rise to order.

Lord Brougham (with great warmth).—This, my lords, is certainly not the way to keep order—(Renewed confusion and uproar).

The Marquis of Londonderry.—I maintain, my Lords, that the noble and learned Lord is com-

pletely out of order.—(The confusion and noise became, if possible, still greater.)

Lord Brougham (labouring under the most violent excitement).—Really, my Lords, this is unfair. Noble Lords on this side of the House—(pointing to the Opposition benches)—listen with the greatest attention to the attack, and yet they refuse to hear one word in defence. I do, my Lords, assure you, that—

The Marquis of Londonderry.—Speak in explanation.

Lord Brougham (with great emphasis).—I tell the noble Marquis that I *am* speaking in explanation. If the noble Duke meant—(here Lord Brougham's tone became more subdued, and his manner less violent)—if the noble Duke meant, as I am persuaded he did mean, the language he made use of only as a joke, I am perfectly willing to take it as such; but if he meant it to be understood as a fact, thereby intending the thing as a personal imputation, then I say—(here Lord Brougham spoke with the greatest emphasis)—that nothing could be more unfounded—nothing could be farther from the truth.

The Duke of Buckingham.—I meant the observation merely as a joke. I was only making use

of the language of Shakspeare in his tragedy of Hamlet.

There was the same expression of self-complacency and evident enjoyment of the scene in the countenance of the noble Duke, as that to which I have already alluded, as he uttered these two sentences. The matter then ended, and the debate was resumed.

The last scene I shall give, occurred on Saturday, the 2nd of August, 1835, immediately on the conclusion of the speech of Mr. Knight on behalf of the Municipal Corporations of England. The accuracy of the following sketch of what then took place may be depended on, as I wrote it down immediately on its occurrence.

Sir Charles Wetherell rose, and advancing to the bar, said, he wished to call their Lordships' attention to the question of hearing evidence on behalf of the Corporations. Sir Charles was proceeding to address their Lordships, when

Lord Brougham rose and said, that really the conduct of the learned Counsel was very irregular. The claim to hear evidence had already been made, and very ably made, by the learned counsel, and it was therefore a very extraordinary course on the part of the Learned Gentleman, after their Lordships

had for two successive days attentively listened to the long speeches which he had addressed to them, and then to the speeches of the other Learned Counsel,—it was very extraordinary on the part of Sir Charles, when he knew it was contrary to the expressed understanding of the House to hear any further observations, to rise, and again seek to urge the claims of the Corporations to have evidence heard at their Lordships' bar. Sir Charles, not being a member of that House, could not move that evidence be heard. That could only be done by one of their Lordships.

A noble Lord said, that what Sir Charles Wetherell wished to state to their Lordships was, that he was now ready to examine witnesses, if their Lordships pleased.

Sir Charles Wetherell assented to this view of the case.

The Earl of Winchelsea then rose, labouring under the greatest excitement, and said—My Lords, I wish, before this question be disposed of, to address a few words to your Lordships. I wish, from the bottom of my heart—

Lord Brougham.—Let Counsel withdraw.

Lord Melbourne.—Counsel must withdraw.

Counsel then withdrew, and

The Earl of Winchelsea, with a warmth and

violence of manner which immediately commanded the deepest attention of their Lordships, resumed—
“ I beg to express a wish, which I feel from the very bottom of my heart, that the noble Viscount at the head of his Majesty’s Government, as he values his own character as well as the safety of this country, will take into his most serious consideration, between this and Monday, the course he will pursue as to this Bill. We are arrived at a most fearful crisis. Never did there exist such a state of things as the present. This House was never in such a situation (Hear, hear! from the Duke of Cumberland and other noble Lords.) And I do not see, after what has passed at the bar of this House—after the able exposure of the certain consequences of this measure, which has been made—how any noble Lord can lay his hand on his heart and vote for this Bill (Hear, hear!) I implore your Lordships, from the bottom of my heart, not for one moment to entertain this most atrocious measure. I would scorn to belong to a House which could entertain it. In God’s name let it be rejected now. (Here the vehemence of the noble Lord’s manner was so great as to impede his utterance, and to render it difficult to catch some of his words. His breast seemed too full to allow of the clear expression of his feelings.) If your Lordships do entertain this

measure, it will be ruinous to the honour and destructive of the peace and tranquillity of the country. I tremble, my Lords, for the consequences which will ensue. You will degrade yourselves if you sanction so monstrous a measure, and you will bring ruin on this once happy land. It is one of the most atrocious attacks ever made on the property and rights of this country.”

Lord Melbourne, who appeared perfectly calm and dispassionate, while there was so much warmth on the opposite side, rose and said,—I move the adjournment of the further consideration of the question till Monday, when I shall move that the House resolve itself into a Committee on the Bill.

The Earl of Winchelsea (still labouring under the most violent excitement).—Then I shall move as an amendment for an address to his Majesty, praying that he will be graciously pleased to order to be laid on your Lordships’ table copies of any instructions given to the Commissioners with which we are unacquainted. I give the noble Viscount notice I shall divide the House on the question.

The Duke of Newcastle.—I wish to understand the noble Viscount correctly. Do you addressing himself to Lord Melbourne) mean to refuse hearing the offered evidence?

Lord Melbourne (with much emphasis).—Certainly.

The Duke of Newcastle (with much energy). — Then I have no hesitation in saying that the conduct of the noble Viscount is contrary to what ought to be the conduct of a man, of a Minister of the Crown, of a British Peer, and of a British subject. He (Lord Melbourne) is taking from the people of this country their property, by the most unconstitutional and most arbitrary means. I have no hesitation in saying I do think that the measure before your Lordships is so atrocious as to render the noble Viscount liable to impeachment; and, if no other person bring forward a motion for his (Lord Melbourne's) impeachment, I myself will do it.

Lord Brougham.—I beg to remind the noble Duke, that in his zeal for the impeachment of my noble Friend he has overlooked the important circumstance, that as he himself will have to act as a judge when my noble Friend is impeached, he cannot also be his prosecutor. The impeachment must come from the Commons: and when the other House does impeach my noble Friend, I shall give the case all the unbiassed and impartial consideration for which the learned Counsel (Mr. Knight) has this day given me credit when sitting in the Court of Chancery.

[Mr. Knight, in the course of his speech, took occasion to state that Lord Brougham had always acted with the strictest impartiality, even when

deciding questions affecting the interests of his most intimate friends, when Lord Chancellor.]

The Earl of Falmouth.—I wish to know whether any noble Lord cannot move, on Monday, that evidence be heard on behalf of the Corporations?

The Duke of Cumberland, who had been so much excited during the last ten minutes as to be unable to remain in his seat, but continued moving from place to place, said:—We are too warm at present for considering the question before the House; we had better adjourn the House till Monday, and between this and that time we shall be better able to decide on what ought to be done.

Lord Brougham.—I believe the illustrious Duke and I are agreed as to the propriety of deferring the further consideration of the measure; but it will never do to adjourn the House before we adjourn the further consideration of the question. The latter must be first moved. “I do not think,” added Lord Brougham, in a peculiarly sarcastic manner, “that we are at all too warm.”

A noble Lord.—I wish to ask the noble Viscount whether there are any other papers to produce respecting this question?

Lord Melbourne.—Not any.

The further consideration of the question was then adjourned till Monday.

CHAPTER V.

LATE MEMBERS.

LORD KING—LORD SUFFIELD.

Lord KING used to take a part in the debates on most questions of importance, especially on those connected with the Church of England. He hated the Church in the aggregate; but the Bishops, or her "titled dignitaries," as he was accustomed to call them, were the objects of his special aversion. As Dr. Johnson avowed himself on all occasions to be an ardent admirer of a good hater, one almost regrets that the learned lexicographer was not a contemporary of Lord King. The Doctor's admiration of his Lordship would have known no limits, for a more cordial unqualified hater of any fellow being, or class of fellow beings, never existed than Lord King, in reference to the Bishops. They were a moral nuisance in his eyes, and the feeling it is right to add, was, in some measure, reciprocal. The religion which the Bishops profess teaches them

to love their enemies ; but as bishops are only men, and as to err is human, they regarded his Lordship with something of the same feeling as he evinced towards them. In short, to use a homely but expressive phrase, “ There was no love lost between them.” That must have been an obstacle of no ordinary kind which would have prevented Lord King’s presence in the House when the Church or the Bishops were about to be brought on the carpet. Nothing short of some physical impediment could, in such a case, have kept him away. To hear the Bishops abused, to see the Church attacked in all her strongholds, was to him, beyond all doubt, the greatest luxury which life could afford. It was bliss beyond compare. It was so supreme that it inspired him with a disrelish for all the ordinary sources of enjoyment. Many were the assaults which his Lordship made on the Church and the Bishops ; indeed, he was a constant thorn in the flesh of ecclesiastical dignitaries, as he sometimes called them. He was not without talent, though the bitterness of spirit with which he assailed them was, to say the least of it, fully as prominent as his abilities. He never minced matters when arraigning the conduct of the Bishops. His epithets of crimination were as unequivocal as they were numerous. Never did human being labour with

greater zeal and more untiring perseverance to turn the tide of public feeling against any class of men, than did Lord King to turn it against the Bishops. That he and others have not laboured in vain, is sufficiently manifest in the state of public feeling on that point, at this moment. His Lordship's hostility to the Church and the Bishops was always sufficiently open ; it was so much so that no one ever charged him with covert enmity to them. Even in many of his speeches on other subjects, you saw undoubted indications of the ruling passion, in the sly cutting sarcasms towards the Bishops with which his matter abounded.

I have said that his Lordship was not without talent. To say no more on that subject were unfair towards his memory. He certainly had no pretensions to be considered a first or even a second rate man, but it is undeniable that he was above mediocrity. His speeches never wanted stamina, though that stamina was not always—indeed hardly ever—of a very superior kind. He was not to be put down by an opponent ; he possessed that moral courage which taught him to fly in the face of the public opinion of his day, and of the numerical votes of both Houses of Parliament. His arguments were usually good, and they seemed to occur to his mind without effort. Though you were

not struck with any ingenuity in his manner of putting them, they were always so cogent, and so much to the point, that you must have found great difficulty in triumphantly combatting them. His language was not much elaborated: it was plain and perspicuous, but strong withal. He spoke with some rapidity, and always fluently. His aim was invariably so clear, that obtuse indeed must have been the mind which failed to perceive it. It would often have been a happy circumstance for the bishops, had they been able with any grace to affect an unconsciousness of his attacks on them and the Church of England. His gesture was liberal, without being redundant.

His voice was fine and sonorous, but he was never sufficiently impassioned in his manner to do justice to it; it did not want compass, but it was seldom or never called into full play. He usually spoke with much ease. He did not hesitate or falter, or become confused. He spoke as one who knew his subject, and who was sufficiently confident in his own intellectual resources. His articulation was always distinct, and his manner, on the whole, pleasant. At times he spoke with a rapidity which impaired the effectiveness of his elocution.

In person he was tall and stout. There was

more of robustness than corpulence in his appearance. His face was full and round. His features were regular, but had nothing indicative of any peculiarity of character. His complexion was florid, and his hair white. At the time of his death in 1834, he was in the fifty-seventh year of his age.

LORD SUFFIELD is one whose name ought to be had in everlasting remembrance. His exertions in the cause of suffering humanity in our West India Colonies were zealous and unremitting. And this not for a short time, but for a long series of years. The noble Lord's exertions to emancipate the slaves in our Colonial possessions, were unequalled both as respects their strenuousness and their duration by those of any other man in the country in the same cause, with the single exception of Mr. Buxton. He, indeed, until Lord Brougham's elevation to the Peerage, stood, in a great measure, alone in the Upper House, in his advocacy of the claims of the negro population of the West Indies. If a few other Peers adventured a word in favour of the 800,000 slaves in that part of the British dominions, it was done timidly, coldly, faintly. It was also done but seldom. On Lord Suffield alone devolved the task, and to him alone belonged the glory, of boldly denouncing negro oppression, and asserting the claims of the

poor slaves to freedom. And this required no ordinary moral courage; for not only was almost every other Peer silent on the subject of the wrongs of the slaves, but almost every one, not excepting some of the most distinguished Liberals, was adverse to their emancipation. Had the cold sneers, the cutting sarcasms, the most abundant ridicule, or the most violent hostility of an overwhelming majority of the House, been sufficient to frighten him from the path of humanity which he had resolved to tread,—he must, in the outset, have shrunk from the advocacy of negro rights. He, however, in the consciousness of the excellence of his cause, fearlessly braved everything, and held on with undeviating consistency in his career, until he saw the great principle which he had so long, so earnestly, so unremittingly asserted, gloriously triumphant. He died soon after. The circumstances under which the noble Lord's death took place are so well known to all, that it were unnecessary to advert to them.

Lord Suffield was a man of talents. They were not of a commanding order, but they were considerably above mediocrity. He was quick at detecting the fallacies or misrepresentations of an opponent, and was usually effective in exposing them. If you never saw anything profound in

his speeches, neither did you ever perceive anything silly or feeble. If you were never startled or delighted by anything brilliant or original, neither were you sickened by anything absurd or stupid. His matter was always respectable, it was often more; it had the merit of being happy. There was frequently much force in his arguments, and ability in the way in which he put them. Those of his opponents who volunteered a reply to his speeches, found, before they had resumed their seats, that the task they had undertaken was by no means so easy as they had flattered themselves it would be before they rose. His argumentation was not refined or ratiocinative, but it was cogent from its inherent clearness, and the simple yet forcible way in which he either vindicated his own positions or assailed those of an opponent. His style was not elaborated; it had no appearance of being forced. It was plain, mixed with occasional traces of carelessness. His periods were not rounded; his speeches would have told with greater effect had they been more so.

As a speaker, the noble Lord did not rank high. His delivery was not good. His voice was weak, and somewhat unmusical, though it could not be said to be harsh. He did not speak with ease or fluency. Occasionally he seemed at a loss

for suitable words wherewith to express himself; at other times he slightly stammered. He spoke in a low subdued tone of voice. He either could not, or would not, raise his voice sufficiently high to produce any effect. Speaking never seemed, for its own sake, to be any source of pleasure to him. Nature never intended him for an orator: and he knew it. Hence he never addressed the House except from a sense of duty. He very seldom spoke except on the great question of negro emancipation—a question which, to his mind, was paramount to all others which ever came before the House since his accession to the Peerage, and which, in so far as public matters were concerned, almost entirely absorbed his thoughts.

His action was moderate. He occasionally raised his right arm slightly, but otherwise stood motionless, with his eye always steadily fixed on the Lord Chancellor. His manner was modest and unassuming in the extreme. His features gave no indication of the moral courage he possessed. One who saw his countenance but did not hear him speak, would have thought him so timid as to be quite incapable of boldly facing a body of men, the great majority of whom were most decidedly hostile to his opinions and objects.

He was about the middle height, and somewhat slenderly made. His complexion was dark. He wore large whiskers, which, like the hair of his head, were of a dark greyish colour. His eye was quick and clear. His brow slightly projected, which gave to his eyes something of a retiring appearance. His countenance had an intelligent and benevolent expression. He was in the fifty-fourth year of his age when the accident occurred, which, in the short space of eight or ten days, terminated in his death.

CHAPTER VI.

TORY PARTY.—DUKES.

DUKE OF CUMBERLAND—DUKE OF WELLINGTON—
 DUKE OF GORDON—DUKE OF NEWCASTLE—DUKE
 OF BUCKINGHAM—DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND
 —DUKE OF BUCCLEUGH.

THE Duke of CUMBERLAND is sure to be known by every stranger of ordinary observation before the latter has been an hour in the House. No person ever entered the gallery, when His Royal Highness was in the House, without—as soon as he had collected his senses, scattered by the novelty of the place and the circumstances by which he found himself surrounded—putting the question to the individual next him, “Who is that Nobleman with the large whiskers and mustachios?” pointing at the same time to the Duke of Cumberland. Not only are His Royal Highness’s whiskers and mustachios of unusually large dimensions, but their milk-white appearance could not fail to make them, were they much smaller, attract the eye of

every stranger. Then there is the ample harvest of hair "silvered o'er by age," which his head always exhibits. But independently of all these peculiarities in the personal appearance of the Duke, there is something so singular—I do not like to use another word lest it might be deemed invidious—something so much out of the usual class, if one may use such phraseology, of human faces, that a stranger's eye must necessarily alight on his out of two or three hundred others. It is one of that class of countenances which makes so deep and permanent an impression on you, that you can, with the greatest ease, call it up in all its individuality before your own mind's eye, but which you find to be difficult, if not impossible, to place vividly before the eye of another. His brow is ample enough, and has something of an intellectual expression; but his eyebrows protrude, and are made more remarkable by his large prominent eyelashes. His eyes are small but quick, with a somewhat unpleasant expression about them. When he knits his brow, and contracts the other features of his face, which he sometimes does in a manner peculiar to himself, his eyes are almost buried in his head. His features, generally, are strongly marked, and have the reverse of a prepossessing appearance. His complexion has something sallow

about it. There are wrinkles in his face, which is of a round form, but they are only few in number, and not very deep or broad in one who has attained the sixty-fifth year of his age. His height is above the usual size, and his figure may be said to be handsome. His countenance has nothing of the glow of health in it, but his body seems strong and compact. He dresses with much simplicity—he is never foppish. A plain brown coat, light vest, light small clothes, and a white hat, is the kind of attire to which he seems most partial.

The Duke of Cumberland is no speaker. I use the word in an emphatic sense; for he has no voice, in the ordinary acceptation of the term. He emits certain sounds, it is true, but they are altogether unlike the ordinary tones of the human voice. The words which proceed from his mouth have a sort of yelping or growling sound, and are generally so imperfectly pronounced, or in so low a tone, as to render it an altogether hopeless task for any one not immediately beside him to perceive what he is saying, however great may be the attention paid to him. Whether or not this singularly imperfect enunciation be the effect of any physical cause, is a question on which I am unable to express an opinion. He speaks seldom, and generally not more than about half a dozen

sentences at a time. The longest speech I ever heard him deliver—if the few sentences uttered in so short a period should be dignified by the name of speech—did not occupy more than five minutes in the delivery. When addressing the House, his manner is most mild and conciliatory. No one, who did not know him, would ever suppose, from his manner, that he could be so ultra in his Toryism, or so zealously attached to his opinions. He stands quite motionless: there is no emphasis in his voice, nor the slightest appearance of warmth about him. He looks a perfect model of political moderation. He never, or at least but seldom, and even then only under very peculiar circumstances, applies a harsh or offensive epithet to his opponents. There is no man in the House who causes him a fiftieth part of the annoyance that Lord Brougham does, and yet he will allude, from time to time, with the greatest apparent good nature, to certain observations of the learned Lord. Nay, in a day or two after Lord Brougham, in one of his furious attacks on him, had called him “the Illustrious by courtesy,” I saw his Royal Highness lean across the table and converse for some time with his Lordship with as much apparent kindness and cordiality of feeling as if nothing had happened.

What are the real feelings with which he regards Lord Brougham are well known to his Royal Highness's friends. He is an excellent politician, however, in so far as external conduct is concerned; it suits his purpose to appear to feel as little as possible under the attacks of his opponents; and he sustains the assumed indifference admirably well.

He is a man of no talent. He has not the remotest pretensions to intellect of any kind, or in any of its various modifications. He has not even the command of tolerable words wherewith to express any sentiment, such as it is, he may entertain. His late memorable letter to the chairman of the Select Committee for an inquiry into the alleged introduction of Orangeism into the army, afforded the most humiliating proof of his utter ignorance of the plainest rules of composition.

He has not the slightest direct influence in the House. No nobleman, except perhaps Lord Kenyon, is directly guided in his conduct by the views which his Royal Highness entertains on any public question. He contrives, however, by indirect means to influence several of the more ultra of his party. In fact, he is, by no means, so bad a tactician as his opponents suppose. He is not

deficient in that species of cleverness which is more generally called cunning.

In my work on the other House of Parliament, I have mentioned the names of several members who are most exemplary in their attendance on their legislative duties. I doubt not many will be startled when I state the fact, that there is not a member in either House who can at all, in this respect, be compared with the Duke of Cumberland. From the moment the doors are opened until they are again closed, you see him in his seat. He is, literally—the door-keeper of course excepted—the first man in the House and the last out of it. And this not merely generally, but every night—no matter how uninteresting the business to be transacted—from the commencement to the close of the Session.

I now come to speak of the most distinguished man of the present day, either in this or any other country. I allude to the Duke of WELLINGTON. It will at once be understood, that in characterising his Grace as the most distinguished man of the present day, I speak of him in his capacity of a general, and not in that of a statesman. In this latter respect, however, I am disposed to assign him a much higher rank than he is generally

allowed to fill by those who entertain political principles opposite to his. If on some great occasions he has failed in his calculation of the probable effects of circumstances, and the probable course of events, it is not to be disputed by his most implacable foes that he has been, in cases of unusual difficulty, successful in others. The mere fact of his carrying on the government of the country during the eventful period which intervened between the resignation of Lord Goderich and the dissolution of his own administration, is of itself unanswerable proof,—known as it is by every one that that government was almost entirely under his own individual guidance,—that his mental resources must be very far from those of a common-place character. It must not only be recollected, that the period during which his administration existed was one unusually critical as regarded the posture both of home and foreign politics; but that he had to undertake the helm of government in the face of perhaps the strongest prejudice that ever assailed any Ministry: a prejudice caused partly by the unpopularity of his avowed high Tory principles, and partly by his memorable declaration, made but a short time before his accession to the Premiership—that he would be mad even to dream of filling that office.

And yet, not only did the noble Duke conduct his government safely through the storms and tempests of the period referred to, but at the very moment he made his ill-judged declaration against all reform, it seemed to be resting more securely than ever. That declaration was not only the most foolish that he ever made—it was infinitely more so than his previous well-known statement, that he regarded county meetings as farces—but it was decidedly the most imprudent that ever proceeded from the lips of a Minister of the Crown. It could not fail to prove, in the then existing circumstances of the country, the destruction of his government. It had hardly escaped his lips, when he himself saw that such would be its inevitable consequence.

But that the Duke of Wellington, notwithstanding defects in his character which prevent his being a statesman of the first class, is more than respectable in that capacity, must be abundantly clear to every mind not blinded by prejudice. His conduct, first in the case of the claims of the Dissenters, and afterwards in the case of the claims of the Roman Catholics, was such as no mind but that of a statesman could ever have suggested. Though mistaking the signs of the times, and ignorant of the state and force of public opinion in other instances, he clearly saw those signs, and correctly

estimated the force of that opinion, as regarded the Test and Corporation Acts, and the disabilities under which the Roman Catholics then laboured. I need not here remark, that this conviction was not wrought on his mind by the arguments or representations of his colleagues in the Cabinet; for they were, to a man, obstinately adverse to concession in either case: it was wholly the result of his own reflections on the matter, and his clear perception of what the exigency of each individual case demanded at his hands. Nor was the fact of his determination to attempt the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and to redress the grievances of the Roman Catholics, under the peculiar and difficult circumstances in which he was placed by his own previous opinions and conduct, and the existing state of sentiment on these topics among his colleagues and friends,—less a proof of his possessing some of the leading attributes of a statesman, than was the fact of his perceiving the then state of public opinion as to the expediency of such measures. That he succeeded in carrying them in the face of obstacles which would not only have appalled ordinary minds, but which seemed altogether insuperable, is a still further evidence of his possession of those attributes. There was hardly I believe, a man in the country but himself, when

he first declared his intention of bringing forward those measures, who, with the House of Lords and the prejudices of George the Fourth in his eye, ever dreamed that the noble Duke would succeed in the objects he had in view.

The Duke of Wellington has generally evinced an intimate knowledge of the resources of his own party, and of the amount of force which would be necessary to carry their point, and defeat their opponents. Hence, as must often have been observed, he has not only on many occasions pursued a more moderate course than those of the more bigotted and less calculating of his Tory friends, but in various cases he has refused to co-operate with them at all. In several instances this refusal to co-operate with his own party against particular measures of a liberal Government, has arisen as much from a conviction of the imprudence of defeating Ministers—had those on his side of the House possessed the power—as from a consciousness of the futility of the attempt. In fact, his whole conduct shows that he is a man of great shrewdness and prudence.

Perhaps no man of the present day possesses greater moral courage than the Duke of Wellington. It is that peculiar description of moral courage, too, which teaches him to disregard alike the opinions both of friends and foes. Let him be but

convinced that a certain measure has become indispensable to the peace or welfare of the country, and to the carrying of that measure, he will lend all his energies in utter disregard alike of the smiles and frowns of others. I do not believe that he is either to be smiled into or frowned out of a particular measure, however seductive the smile in the one case, or ominous the frown in the other. He appears as indifferent to popularity as any public man I know of the present day.

Indeed, my impression is, that his moral courage is so extreme as to degenerate into a blemish in his character. It was his utter indifference to popularity that prompted his ill-judged and, to his own Government, fatal declaration of November 1829, against all reform. And the same disregard of public opinion contributed, there can be no doubt, to his resolution to centre the entire government of the country in his own person during the space which intervened between the ejection of the Melbourne Ministry in November 1834, and the return of Sir Robert Peel from Italy. That was an experiment which no one, not even his own greatest friends, ever undertook to justify. It was an experiment, indeed, which admitted of no justification; but was considered by his own party, as

well as by those of opposite politics, to be as unconstitutional as it was bold and daring.

One of the greatest defects in the character of the Duke as a statesman is, his neither anticipating public opinion, nor keeping abreast with it. He generally resists it till it has acquired an overwhelming power. Had he, when in office, only granted a moderate measure of reform, the nation would have been satisfied, at least for a time, and he might still have been Prime Minister of the country. But by his refusal to yield one iota to the public demand, that demand became more extensive in its scope, and louder in its tone, until it could no longer be resisted with safety to the public peace.—He refuses the little which would be gratefully received as an act of grace, and then finds himself in the end compelled to make a much larger concession, for which he does not even receive the thanks of his countrymen.

His general information is neither varied nor profound; but he very seldom commits blunders in his speeches. He always pays particular attention to any question of importance before the House, before he ventures to open his mouth on it. And there are few men who can so speedily master the leading details of any question. His

mind is acute, and his understanding vigorous; so that, in as far as the mere matter of his speeches is concerned, he generally appears to some advantage. He often strikes out new courses of thought, but seldom pursues them far. It is nothing uncommon to hear him urge a series of ingenious arguments in favour of his view of the subject, without what is called dwelling on them. He is always clear: you can never mistake the position he labours to establish, nor can you ever fail to perceive the immediate bearing of his observations on that position.

Were his diction and manner good, the noble Duke would rank high as a speaker, but both are bad. His style is rough and disjointed—sometimes positively incorrect: it is always, however, nervous and expressive. His manner of speaking is much worse than his diction. He has a bad screeching sort of voice, aggravated by an awkward mode of mouthing the words. His enunciation is so bad, owing in some measure to the loss of several of his teeth, that often, when at the full stretch of his voice, you do not know what particular words he is using. At other times, and this too while his gesture is vehement, he speaks in so low and peculiar a sort of tone, that you lose, perhaps, whole sentences together.

The Duke feels strongly on political questions, and there is always great energy in his manner when expressing his sentiments. He generally makes a liberal use of his arms, especially his right one, when on his legs, and moves his body about for the purpose of enabling him to look his own friends, in different parts of the House, in the face. In his more vehement moods, he frequently falls into what, in parliamentary language, is called the habit of expectoration. His whole soul is thrown into his subject. You see at once that he has no ambition to play the orator. He never uses a word more than is necessary, nor does he attempt rhetorical flourishes. His speeches are full of feeling and sentiment. You are only surprised when you see the intensity of the former, if in opposition to any measure before their Lordships,—that he does not divide the House on the subject.

Notwithstanding his having attained the advanced age of sixty-seven, he is full of spirits, and apparently in excellent health. The conformation of his face is, by portraits, or otherwise, so familiar to every one, that it is unnecessary to describe it. I may simply mention that his hair is of a greyish colour and that his complexion is pale and wan. His eye is quick and piercing, and his whole countenance is highly indicative of energy and deter-

mination. In height he is rather above the middle size. His form, for one of his years, is slender, and remarkably erect. In his clothes he appears to evince a partiality to a blue coat, and light vest and trousers. They are seldom well made, but hang rather loosely on him.

The Duke of GORDON'S voice is never heard in the House; but the frequency with which his name comes before the public, entitles him to a notice in this work. He is one of the most extreme Tories in the House. His dislike of Liberal principles has grown into a detestation of them. The prominent part he has taken in promoting Orangeism, both in England and in Scotland, is known to all. His opposition to the Melbourne Administration is as strenuous as opposition can be; but it is not that sort of opposition which has its origin in factious motives or considerations. It is not for the sake of his party, regarded in the abstract, that he uses all the influence he possesses to eject the Melbourne Ministry; it is for the sake of his principles, which are dear to him as his own life, that that influence is so exerted. He firmly believes that Toryism, in its purest and most unadulterated form, is the greatest blessing which a nation can enjoy; and he acts on the conviction. Every one, therefore, must give him credit for his integrity and con-

sistency, however much he may be conceived to be in error.

I have just mentioned that he never speaks. I believe the last occasion on which he opened his mouth in the House was in 1819, when Marquis of Huntly. His speech on that occasion was against Queen Caroline, and was equally remarkable for its brevity, and for its hostility to that Lady. As I have never heard him, under any circumstances, speak in public, I am, of course, unable to give any information from my own observation as to the manner in which he acquits himself. Those who have heard him speak in public, report unfavourably of him; which report is tacitly confirmed by the fact of his never speaking in his place in Parliament.

In person he is tall, and handsome for one who has attained the age of sixty-six. He walks with as quick and firm a step as if he were only in his thirtieth year. His hair is of a light grey colour approaching to whiteness. His features are handsome and his face is of the oval form. His complexion is ruddy. His appearance is commanding and dignified in a very great degree.

The Duke of NEWCASTLE takes an active part in the proceedings of the House: not in the shape of speaking himself, but in concerting those measures

with his party which are deemed most likely to stem the torrent of Liberalism. In this respect he is one of the most zealous and unremitting in his exertions among the Conservative Peers. And, somehow or other, he has much greater influence with his party than the intemperance of his language when speaking, or the well-known ultraism of his opinions, would lead one to infer. If he speak but comparatively seldom, he takes care that the little he does speak shall not pass unheeded: that is to say, if a loud, husky, screeching voice, accompanied with the most extravagant gesticulation, will attract attention. One regrets to see so much useless passion and so much bodily violence thrown away in the delivery of a speech which contains nothing deserving the name of argument; while the clumsiness and inaccuracy of its diction would disgrace a school-boy in his first efforts at composition. I never hear his Grace dealing about his denunciations at the heads of the Liberals—for his speeches, if so they must be called, almost invariably consist of the most violent diatribes—without regretting that a portion of his animation and energy is not transferred to some other noble Lord, who has no action, but whose talents are of an order which afford some guarantee that he would turn it to good account. If, for example,

Lord Ellenborough were, to use the phrasology of chemists, to absorb the energy and animation which escape from his Grace, he would prove of considerable additional service to his party. His Grace, in his more violent moods, appears in excellent condition for literally pulling an opponent to pieces, were he unfortunately within his reach. To describe his manner on such occasions were impossible. No description could convey a better idea of it than the simple exclamation so often made by strangers in the gallery—"What a passion he is in!" There is one principle that pervades all his speeches, namely, the celebrated principle of "one's right to do what he likes with his own." He holds that his votes are as much his own property as his opinions; and that as he has a right to think, so he has a right to vote, as he pleases, without having the wisdom or propriety of his conduct called in question. Other noble Lords, there can be no doubt, hold the same sentiment, but then they do so with certain qualifications, and are more guarded in their manner of expressing themselves on the subject. I much question whether his Grace would *argue* on any public measure, even if he could. He glorifies himself so much on his possession of the power to vote and act as he thinks proper, that I am inclined to think he looks on mere reasoning

as a very useless thing; as only a species of clever trifling with their Lordships' time and attention. The ultraism of his Grace's politics, and the violence of his manner, are ably seconded by his personal appearance in his efforts to attract attention, when speaking. He is very tall, very stout, and very unwieldy in his physical conformation. His features are large and strongly marked. His face is full, and inclines to the rotund form. His complexion is dark, and his hair has something of a greyish hue. His countenance does not decidedly express any particular quality of mind; you certainly would not form a correct notion of his character by applying to it the principles of Lavater. He looks rather older than he is, being only in his fiftieth year.

The Duke of BUCKINGHAM is sure to attract the attention of a stranger in the House, whether he happens to speak or not. His personal proportions are of a very unusual size. You may walk six months in the streets of London before you encounter so stout a man. His frame is, doubtless, naturally corpulent, and an easy disposition of mind, a life of indolence, and good living, have, in his case, effectually seconded Nature's purposes. He is pot-bellied, and rejoices in a face, the size of which does no discredit to his general stoutness.

The complexion of his countenance has something of a sallowness about it, and his hair is of a dark brown colour. He has large laughing eyes, deeply set: his features generally are highly indicative of that species of cheerfulness which may be most justly characterised by the term "jolly!" When speaking of an opponent, or even looking at him from his seat, you see, from a peculiar expression in his eye, a lurking disposition to be sarcastic at his expense. In the chapter on "Scenes in the House," I have given a lively one, in which his Grace was the principal performer. As there mentioned, there was something in his looks, as well as in the tones of his voice, of so very quizzical a kind, that Lord Brougham must have been as much stung by them as by the words themselves. Any one who chanced to observe the countenance of the noble Duke a little before he made the onset, must, though the merest novice in physiognomy, have perceived how he was, in his own mind, quizzing the Lord Chancellor. As a speaker, he has no pretensions to distinction. His style is bad; it is usually rough and incorrect. His matter is, if possible, still worse; ideas, he has few or none: the commodities in which he chiefly deals are declamation and rhapsody. If it be a sin to mangle figures of speech, and grossly to pervert the best tropes of other men, by

applying them to some absurd matter of his own, never was public man more guilty than his Grace. He treated the House to some choice samples of his capabilities in this way when opposing, in 1832, the second reading of the Reform Bill. It would occupy too much space to transfer these to our pages; but I may mention that, among other things to which he compared the Reform Bill, was that of a spell, which, he said, quoting from Shakspeare's tragedy of Macbeth, had been formed to

“ Untie the winds, and let them fight
Against the churches—to let the yeasty waves
Confound and swallow navigation up—
To let the castles topple on our heads,
And palaces and pyramids to slope
Their heads to the foundation.”

The authors of the Reform Bill might call that measure by the name of Reform; but the noble Duke maintained its proper character was that of Republicanism, and following out the idea, he played havoc among a few more figures of rhetoric. “It was,” he said, “the spirit of Republicanism that would be insinuated in the habit and form of the British Constitution. The demon of Republicanism, in all its hideousness, was before them in that Bill! He trusted that it would find its final repose in that House—that it would be laid

in a Red Sea of rest, no more to 'fright the isle from its propriety.'" His Grace is amazingly fond of quoting Shakspeare in his speeches; but he always, wherever practicable, palms off the borrowed passages as his own. In the scene already referred to between him and Lord Brougham, in the Session of 1834, he passed off the phrase, "drinking potations pottle deep," as his own; and it was only when Lord Brougham put the question to him in a regular home-thrust style, whether he meant to apply the words to him (Lord Brougham) personally, that the noble Duke, for the purpose of averting unpleasant consequences, came out with the admission that the words were from one of Shakspeare's plays. I may here mention, that until his Grace confessed the plagiarism, every one present gave him the credit of their originality.

The noble Duke is no bad hand, when he chooses to put forth his strength, at what is called coarse abuse. Take the following specimen from the same speech, in opposition to the second reading of the Reform Bill. Speaking of the frightful evils which would result from the creation of the Metropolitan Boroughs, he said, "They had heard of Paris constituting all France, and they were now to hear of London constituting all England. And what," he asked "was London?"

Were they to look for the purity of representation in the hallowed shades of the Tower Hamlets—in the classical haunts of Billingsgate, and the modest precincts of St. Mary-le-bone? They had heard of Westminster's pride and England's glory, but he believed it would be difficult to bestow an eleemosynary penny in the Strand, without hazarding the appearance of bribing a Westminster elector; and if a short-sighted candidate chanced to overlook a beggar, he might have to mourn over the loss of a vote. Why, the cholera was nothing to the risk of this contamination—the pestilence was nothing to it—and yet this was the way in which the representation of England was to be purified."

In politics his Grace is a decided Tory, though one of those who profess to be moderate reformers. When he concluded the speech from which I have culled the above flowers of rhetoric, he gave notice that, in the event of the measure then before the House being rejected, he had a Reform Bill of his own ready, which he meant to propose in its stead. The leading feature of his Grace's measure was to couple the nomination boroughs in the return of members, giving one representative to every pair of those boroughs, and beginning the union by joining Old Sarum and Gatton together. The members

who would be excluded by this scheme from Parliament were to be transferred to Manchester, Birmingham, and one or two other large towns, where, in the first instance, due care was to be taken that the qualification should be sufficiently high. The Reform Bill, however, being carried, his Grace's substitute was never brought formally forward.

He is a nobleman of considerable influence in the House. He is, indeed, regarded as the head of a certain party in that House, amounting to thirty or forty, and numbering among its members the Duke of Northumberland, the Earl of Arundel, &c.

He speaks frequently, but never long at a time. I have already endeavoured to give some idea of the matter of his speeches: his manner is still worse. He works himself, in the majority of cases, into a passion—sometimes into a towering one. In the latter case he raises his voice, which is naturally shrill and penetrating, to such a pitch of loudness, that the sounds are reverberated from the walls and ceiling of the House. The consequence is, if there be not an Irishism in the expression, that sometimes you cannot hear him from the very loudness of his voice. In the Session of 1834, a gentleman belonging to the reporting establishment of a Morning Paper, gravely assigned the reason of his not being

able to give his Grace's speech, to the extreme loudness of the tone in which he spoke. His action is correspondingly violent, and has, owing to the unwieldy character of his person, a very awkward effect. One wonders at seeing so much zeal and energy of manner displayed in a man who has reached the sixtieth year of his age.

The Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND never speaks in the House. I am not aware that he has for some years past delivered even a single sentence in it. In other words, he is never, according to the usual acceptation of the parliamentary phrase, to be seen "on his legs." And as I have never heard him speak at any public meeting, I am unable to give any information as to what his qualifications as a speaker are,—if he have any. But though the noble Duke never utters a syllable in the House, there are few noblemen whose names are better known to the public. His vast estates, bringing him in, it is said, an annual revenue of nearly 250,000*l.*,—being but little under that of any other peer of the realm, and half as large as that allowed his Majesty himself,—necessarily make him a person of so much importance as to keep his name continually before the public eye; and the eminence to which his great property and consequent influence have, as a matter of course, raised him,

has been largely increased by the circumstance of his having lately filled the important situation of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. In person he is rather above the ordinary height, and of a slender make. His complexion is of a sandy colour. In his countenance there is nothing remarkable; but it is indicative of that illness to which the noble Duke has been subject for many years, and which, in addition to bodily suffering, is the source of much inconvenience to him. His appearance and manners are gentlemanly, without anything of the haughtiness of the aristocrat. He seldom attends the House—scarcely ever, except when some important question is before it. It was matter of surprise to many of his friends, that, with his bodily indisposition and princely income, he should ever have undertaken the arduous duties of the Viceroyship of Ireland. He merits praise for not neglecting the duties of the office so long as he filled it. It is true that he was not popular with the Roman Catholic part of the population of Ireland; nor was it to be expected, as he went there a decided friend to Protestant ascendancy under the auspices of a Tory government. But it is a fact which ought to be mentioned to his credit, that he was, perhaps, as popular a Tory Lord Lieutenant with the Catholics as any Viceroy appointed to the office by the same

Tory party for many years past. It is understood he did not feel the situation to be a bed of roses; and it is believed that, whatever future changes may take place in his day in the councils of the King, he will not aspire to any of the offices which the Government may have at its disposal. He is in the fifty-first year of his age.

The Duke of BUCCLEUGH must also, from the extent of his estates, which, with the property left him by a relation, are understood to bring him in an annual revenue of 250,000*l.*, always possess considerable influence. His talents, from any indication he has yet given of them, certainly do not hold out any prospect of his ever acquiring much influence by any senatorial exhibitions he is likely to make. He never speaks, or at least but seldom, on any question except those which relate to Scotland. The little he does say is always to the point, but there is never anything in it above the merest commonplace. He seems incapable of penetrating the surface: I doubt if he have ever yet, on any occasion, or on any subject, been the author of a single felicitous idea. His voice is thin, but clear and pleasant. He has so much of the Scottish accent, that before he has uttered a dozen words any English ear would inevitably discover that he is a Scotchman. He talks with considerable ease, but

is always cold and monotonous. He has not the slightest animation in his manner, or energy in his action. He is good-looking: his features are small and regular, and wear an expression of mildness approaching to simplicity. His complexion is fair, and his hair is of a sandy colour. He is about the middle height, and rather handsomely made. He is one of the youngest Peers in the House, being only in his thirtieth year.

CHAPTER VII.

TORY PARTY.—MARQUISES.

THE MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY—THE MARQUIS OF
WELLESLEY—THE MARQUIS OF SALISBURY.

THE Marquis of LONDONDERRY has made himself conspicuous, both within and without the House, by his extraordinary zeal, on all occasions, on behalf of the most ultra Tory principles. He is undoubtedly the most imprudent advocate in the Upper House of that class of principles. He never wastes a thought on the peculiar circumstances in which either himself personally or his party as a body may be placed by the course he pursues. Toryism is from heaven, and it would make a heaven on earth if it had only fair play. Of all this there can be no doubt. The noble Marquis, at any rate, has no more doubt of it than he has of his own existence. Why then, he argues, not boldly assert Tory principles at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances? The extraordinary zeal he evinced in favour of Tory principles, and against

the Reform Bill, when that measure was under discussion in the Upper House, put his life in more than one instance in imminent peril. An infuriated mob on two occasions, at the period I refer to, attacked him in the streets, and he narrowly escaped with his life. Did this induce him to pursue a more moderate, or, to use another term, more prudent course? It did not. He was as vehement the first time afterwards he entered the House, in his denunciations of the "Revolutionary Bill," and as loud in his praises of unadulterated Toryism, as before. As respects his party, he has, times without number, done infinite damage to them by the recklessness and imprudence of his political conduct. In fact they have no sooner got themselves—it may be with a world of difficulty—out of one false position in which he had placed them, than he lands them in another. Ofttimes would they give any thing to purchase his silence; but, like that of Colonel Sibthorpe, in the other House, it is above all price;—it is not to be purchased. When coaxing—I do not like the word, but I know no better—argument, remonstrance, entreaty, have all been used in vain to induce him to keep his lips sealed, and to make himself as comfortable as possible in his seat,—I have often seen some friend, who could use greater

freedom with him than others, seize him by the tails of the coat, and by a rather forcible pull, endeavour to make him resume his seat. I do not, however, recollect a single instance in which this species of persuasion proved effectual, after he was fairly on his legs, though I have on several occasions seen him prevented from speaking when pulled down by the tails of his coat while in the act of rising. If you “tit” him after he has begun his speech, he turns about and emits an angry glance at you; as much as to say—“You may save yourselves the trouble, my friends, for I will have my own way of it. The Constitution is at stake, and I must do what I can to save it.” And he does have his own way; though it admits of question with no one but himself, that, instead of contributing any thing to the salvation of the Constitution, his speeches have the effect of accelerating the catastrophe they are intended to avert. When he rises to address the House on any question of delicacy and importance, it is no uncommon thing to see the more cautious and prudent of his party look each other significantly in the face, as if fearing some calamity is about to befall their cause. And during the time he is on his legs, they listen with the most anxious attention to every word which falls from his lips; thankful, on the one hand, when he makes

no serious slips, but always labouring, on the other, under the most painful apprehension of something awkward and injurious to their cause coming from him in the next sentence.

The great defect of the noble Marquis's political character is his want of judgment. It were almost impossible to name a public man who has less. In cases where the most ordinary judgment might clearly see the path of prudence, he is sure to mistake it. If there be a right and a wrong course to follow, he will inevitably choose the wrong one.

He has one redeeming quality in his character as a public man: he is strictly honest and straightforward. He is not the person to compromise or abandon his principles, however alluring the temptation held out to him. Nor will he under any circumstances or for any consideration conceal or disguise them. Out they must come; he must exhibit them to your gaze, in all their native nakedness, however hideous they may appear to you. Others of his party may in some measure soften down their principles by arraying them in a mild and conciliatory phraseology;—he disdains all such temporising with his principles—for so he considers it. Others may look upon the Poles in their late resistance to Russian tyranny as rebels, but they will take care not to say as much. The noble Marquis is out with

it at once : he calls them in good set terms, “ a nation of rebels.” Through this extreme integrity in his conduct, the whole country have as clear an insight into the interior of the Marquis of Londonderry’s bosom as he possesses himself.

He is a man of honour as well as honesty. He would disdain to stoop to anything inconsistent with the acknowledged laws of honour, however much his own personal interests might be affected by the course he pursues. He would a thousand times sooner sacrifice the dearest object of his ambition than compromise a friend. His conduct last year, in relinquishing at once, and of his own free will, an appointment as the representative of his Sovereign at the Court of St. Petersburg, rather than that Sir Robert Peel should be placed in a false position, affords an unequivocal illustration of this.

He is a man of no talent. He cannot argue any question in a passable manner ; nor can he make a connected speech on any question, even when he has most carefully studied the subject at home. His ideas, such as they are, are always ill assorted, and they seem to have a marked predilection for playing “ hide and seek ” with him. They are quite an unmanageable progeny ; they are fully as great “ rebels as the Poles.” It is a thousand to one, after he has sat down, if you have any definite

notion of the tenor of his remarks. If you recollect two or three of his leading ideas, and conjecture the positions at which he has been hammering away, with all imaginable zeal certainly, but in the roughest possible manner,—you have abundant cause to congratulate yourself on your habits of attention.

His style is in keeping with his ideas. It is rugged and disjointed. He was never yet known to stumble on a tolerably turned period.

And as for his elocution, it is still worse, if that be possible, than either. His voice is the harshest and most croaking I ever heard; it sounds as if it were literally forced out of his mouth by some powerful compression of his acoustical organs. Whether it be painful for the noble Marquis himself to speak, I cannot say; I incline to the opinion it must: of this I am certain, it is very unpleasant to every body else to hear him. His utterance is rather slow; he stammers occasionally, but not much. He never makes long speeches, but he addresses the House on almost every subject. His favourite theme is the affairs of the Peninsula. He allows no opportunity to slip of holding up Don Miguel, Don Carlos, and all the other Dons of despotism, as paragons of every thing that is amiable and virtuous; and their Governments, as the mildest and best under

heaven. As he is not to be reasoned out of his propensity for speech-making by his friends, so neither will he be sneered or ridiculed out of it by his enemies. Many a bitter taunt does he get from the Liberals, and many a term of ridicule is applied by them to him, because of his foolish speeches about the "affairs of the Peninsula," but all without effect. He neither heeds their sneers nor their sarcasms. He is perfectly impermeable to anything and everything of the kind. Even Lord Brougham, who is a terror to every body else, when he is expected to scatter his bitter sneers and withering invectives about him, is armed with no terror to him. He is quite impervious to anything the noble Lord can say. In fact, he has been so long accustomed to this sort of treatment, that it were surprising if it had any effect upon him.

In the gesture of the noble Marquis, there is little on which to remark. It is not extravagant, though his seeming zeal for his principles and his party would naturally lead one to infer that it is so. He moves his right arm slightly, and occasionally his body, so as that he may get a glimpse of his friends immediately around him; but this is the utmost extent of his action.

He almost invariably causes great annoyance to

those of his own friends who address their Lordships from that part of the House in which he sits. Whenever one of them rises, or is expected to rise to speak, from that part of the House, he removes from the first bench to one of the seats or rather "sacks," immediately before the Woolsack; when, laying his chin or the side of his head in his right hand, he stares at them with an intensity and uninterruptedness of gaze, from the beginning to the end of their oration, which were enough to disconcert any man not possessed of unusually strong nerves. The only redeeming circumstance in this part of the noble Marquis's conduct, is, that he greets them with a pretty frequent cheer, which always has the merit of being a most hearty one.

Lord Londonderry is known as the author of a "History of the Peninsular War." It is well understood, however, that he has no right to the credit of any literary merit the work may possess. He merely furnished the materials or facts. The Rev. Mr. Gleig, author of the "Subaltern," &c., put it into that shape in which it was submitted to the public.

The Marquis of Londonderry is a handsome man. He is above the middle height, and well formed. His countenance has nothing of harshness in it. It is rather, if any thing, of a pleasant

expression. His features are regular, and his face inclines to the oval conformation. His complexion has something of the florid in it, and his hair is of a light brown colour. He appears to be in excellent health, and looks considerably younger than one who has entered his fifty-eighth year.

The Marquis of WELLESLEY strikes you the moment you see him, by his personal resemblance to his relative, the Duke of Wellington. You would infer at once that they belonged to the same family. Perhaps the noble Marquis is rather stouter, and looks more robust than his Grace. In height he is of the average size. His features have something of a soft expression about them ; but they do not indicate any peculiar intellectual quality. His complexion is fair, and his hair of a light colour. His appearance never fails to command veneration. He is a man of some talent, but is very defective in judgment. He hardly ever speaks, but when he does, never without betraying his deficiency in this respect. In his study, however, his judgment is more to be relied on,—the defect not being an inherent one : it is, in a great measure, accidental. It is chiefly caused by a shortness of temper, which makes him impatient of contradiction or opposition. I am sure no one can be more sensible than himself of the imprudence of

many of the expressions he utters in the House, when he reads them coolly, as reported in the Morning Papers, at his breakfast on the following day. He is a fluent speaker: his voice is not strong, but it is pleasant; and so clear and distinct as to make him audible in all parts of the House. In the matter of his speeches, which have been but few in number of late years, there is not much to commend. It is quite of a commonplace character. You never meet in his speeches with a single happy idea; nothing that impresses itself on your mind. If you were put to the rack for it, the odds are that you could not, on quitting the House, give any intelligible account of the general scope of his observations. You cannot, however, complain of any want of words: in passably good phraseology he is by no means deficient; though it must not be forgotten, that his diction appears, from his easy and fluent manner of delivery, to possess graces, which, in point of fact, it does not possess. He is one of those speakers who, if reported literally as they express themselves, would not appear to one's eye to the same advantage as they do to one's ears. He has not been regular in his attendance in his place in Parliament for some years past. His excuse is to be found in his advanced years, for he has encountered seventy-

six “summers’ heats and winters’ colds,”—in addition to the fatigues of a long and active service, in different parts of the world, in the cause of his country.

The Marquis of SALISBURY takes a somewhat prominent part in the proceedings of the House. He has the good sense, however, to perceive that he was not intended by Nature for an orator, and consequently confines his addresses to their Lordships to questions of very secondary importance. And even then, without promising it, he invariably acts on the principle of not trespassing at length, as other noble Lords express it, on the attention of the House. He is always brief. He speaks very inaccurately. He often hesitates for suitable words, and very often when he has pronounced two or three different ones, takes the worst after all. He stammers at every fifth or sixth sentence; not, however, to such an extent as to render his speaking very unpleasant. His language is plain; it has no polish; nor is there much to commend in his matter: its only merit is, that it bears directly on the question before the House. In speaking, he uses scarcely any gesture: all he does use consists in a rapid movement, up and down, of his head. The motion of the noble Marquis’s head has often appeared to me like that of a person who had engaged to give

a certain number of nods in a given time. His voice is weak; or if it does possess any power, he never calls his stentorian capabilities into effect. He speaks with some rapidity. Altogether, he appears to be one of those,—though, as already stated, he speaks with some frequency,—who either have no ambition to be considered orators, or who have sense enough to perceive that all their efforts to attain that distinction would be wholly fruitless.

Personally, there is nothing peculiar about the noble Marquis. He is of dark complexion, with hair of a brown colour; a small part of the crown of his head is bald. His features are somewhat strongly marked, but they do not express any decided quality of mind. His face has something of an angular conformation. One would take him to be at least fifty years of age, but he is only in his forty-fifth year.

CHAPTER VIII.

TORY PARTY—EARLS.

EARL OF ELDON—EARL OF WICKLOW—EARL OF
 LIMERICK—EARL OF WINCHELSEA—EARL RODEN
 —EARL OF ABERDEEN—EARL OF HADDINGTON
 —EARL OF HARROWBY—EARL OF ROSSLYN—
 EARL OF MANSFIELD.

LORD ELDON, though his name has of late years been comparatively unheard of, filled for more than half a century too large a space in the public eye, and identified himself too much with the most important passing occurrences of that very eventful period, to be passed over in silence in a work of this kind. Few men have exerted a greater influence over the destinies of this country than did Lord Eldon during the first twenty-five or thirty years of the present century. After the death of Pitt he became the Coryphæus of Toryism. Though Lord Liverpool, from that time till 1826, filled the office of Prime Minister, there can be no question that Lord Eldon was looked on as the great cham-

pion and supporter of that class of principles. That his talents were * of a very high order, no one but the most blinded partisan of opposite principles could ever have denied or doubted, and therefore his talents alone must always have made him a man of consideration with his party; but irrespective of mere talent, the circumstance of his occupying the highest judicial place in the land,—his being the Speaker of the Upper House of Parliament, and what, in common phraseology, is called the “Keeper of the King’s conscience,”—was one which must have necessarily added greatly to any importance which mere talent could have given him. The zeal, too, which he invariably manifested for his principles and party, must have gone far to endear his name to the Tories. Toryism may be said to have been part and parcel of his existence: apart from it, he saw nothing in the world worth living for. His notion indeed was, that if in the struggle Toryism had to maintain during the whole of his career, but especially in the latter part of it, with Liberalism, or Revolution, as he always called the latter, it should be vanquished,—then things had come to such a pass as to call for the end of the world itself.

* In this, as in some other cases, I am obliged to speak in the past tense, because, though still alive physically, the noble Lord must be regarded as politically dead.

He could conceive of nothing more anomalous than Liberalism in the ascendant in the councils of the King. It is no exaggeration to say, that he would have considered physical calamities, whatever may have been their extent, evils of minor magnitude. The abstraction of Toryism was ever present to his mind : it had a sort of impersonation in his eye ; and when he thought in private, or talked in public, of his political principles, he did both as if it had been of the dearest personal friend he had on earth. If you attacked Toryism, he felt precisely as if you had attacked himself. To have entertained any thing like cordial friendship for a person of opposite principles would have been utterly impossible for him : it was not in his nature. He hugged his principles to his bosom, with a sincerity and fulness of affection unsurpassed by that with which the most tender-hearted mother regards her children. Never was human being more devotedly attached to his creed than was Lord Eldon to Toryism. Nothing in the world, no temptation, however great, could ever have induced him to compromise it in the smallest iota. Had the alternative of an abandonment of his political principles, or martyrdom, no matter under what form, been on any occasion presented him, he would not have hesitated a moment

in making his choice: he would at once have avowed his preference for the latter.

The first severe shock which his feelings sustained on account of his principles, was when the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel openly avowed themselves proselytes to the expediency of conceding Catholic Emancipation. But in that case his spirits were partly sustained by the hope—a hope to which he fondly clung till the last moment—that the House of Lords would never accede to the second reading of a Bill having such an object in view. Even when disappointed here, he found some slight consolation from the possibility that the King might have his eyes opened to the peril to which, as he conceived, he would expose his person and his throne, should he assent to that measure,—and consequently that he would refuse his signature to it. When disappointed in this also, he was overwhelmed with grief. He felt as if some personal calamity of the first magnitude had overtaken him. This may be supposed by some, not sufficiently acquainted with the strength of Lord Eldon's political feelings and prejudices, to be a poetical licence of expression: it is not so. Those who know the noble Lord in private will bear their willing testimony to its truth. He mourned over the passing

of the Bill for the Emancipation of the Catholics every hour and minute of the day, and it interrupted his slumbers in the night. Those who witnessed the extraordinary zeal with which, in despite of all the infirmities of old age, he resisted that measure in its progress through the Lords, will not see anything hyperbolical in the phraseology I have employed.

He not only foresaw, but foretold as the inevitable and speedy consequences of conceding Catholic Emancipation, what he regarded as other breaches in the constitution. Still I do not suppose, active and great as his apprehensions were, that such a measure as the Reform Bill was ever conjured up by his imagination. He was astounded when Lord John Russell first proposed it in the other House; but his surprise soon gave place to indignation at what he considered the audacity of those who could seriously bring such a measure forward. With the latter feeling were mingled emotions of joy at the thought that the Grey Ministry, from the very recklessness of the measure, had not only overreached themselves by insuring its defeat in the Upper House, but that they had given a death-blow to themselves as a government, and put the return of their party to office beyond the pale of possibility. When, therefore, he was informed by his own most

intimate political friends, that however much they disapproved of the Reform Bill—I speak of the first one—the alarming state of the country imposed on them the necessity of assenting to its second reading; when he was apprised of this, the information had the effect of a thunderbolt on his mind. It was some time before he could be brought to believe that the Lords were, as he conceived, as much bent on the destruction of their own order, and the utter subversion of the constitution, as the country seemed resolved to involve itself in irremediable ruin. The second reading of the Bill brought the startling and frightful fact home to his mind. Shocked, however, as he was, by that awful dereliction of their principles—for so he considered it on the part of the Peers—he still clung to the hope that it would be either thrown out in its further progress through the House, or be defeated by the King refusing his assent to it. The memorable success of Lord Lyndhurst's motion for the transposition of Schedules A. and C. afforded a temporary realization of his hopes. His joy during the few days of the subsequent interregnum was as great as his previous grief. That joy, however, was but of short duration: in the brief space of eight days he saw the discomfited ex-Ministry restored to office on the sole ground of their identi-

fication with Reform, and with the moral certainty before them—for he now saw the Peers could no longer, in existing circumstances, help themselves—of carrying the measure or one essentially the same to a triumphant issue. The sudden transition, first, from fear and sorrow to hope and joy, and again from the latter to the former states of mind to a still greater extent, had, it is well known to Lord Eldon's private friends, a most injurious effect on the physical constitution of one at his very advanced stage of life.

I dwell at greater length on the intensity of Lord Eldon's feelings with regard to the two great measures of Catholic Emancipation and Reform, because there can be no question that they have contributed to the almost entire withdrawal of the noble Lord from the House—of which I shall have to speak presently—since the latter became the law of the land. The way in which he sometimes spoke, when addressing their Lordships in opposition to Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill, showed of itself, though there had existed no other means of ascertaining what his feelings were on these subjects, that he considered those measures in the same light as personal calamities of the most painful nature. The tear, on such occasions, silently glistened in his eye: it was visible to all those

Peers who were near him, when, after the passing of one of these measures, he made the memorable declaration of his belief—"Now the sun of England's glory is for ever set." Since then he has been but seldom in the House. He looks on the country as lost beyond all hope of recovery. He talks in private on the subject as if he had outlived his time by outliving the Constitution. He mourns over the Toryism of a former day, when in its high and palmy state, as over a departed friend with whom his existence might in some measure be said to be bound up. He has not since opened his mouth above once or twice, and even then has never said more than two or three words at a time, which have been delivered in so low and melancholy a tone as to be inaudible to all but those within two or three yards of him.

Lord Eldon, as I have already stated, was undoubtedly a man of considerable talents. He was never what is called an orator; but there was always something in his manner, independently of the respect entertained by all parties for his character, which never failed to command attention. He was not so expert at detecting the weak and absurd points of an opponent, if he spoke on the impulse of the moment, as many others of his party were; but if he replied to-day to a speech which was delivered the

previous day, he generally did so with ingenuity and talent. The chief characteristic of his speeches was the absence of all meretricious ornament. His style was simple, yet nervous. He was generally clear. It was obvious he had no ambition to be considered a fine speaker; but if he had, his ambition would not have been gratified. He was constitutionally cold and tame in his manner. Sometimes he argued questions sophistically, but the instances in which he did so were rare. He had too high an opinion of the inherent excellency of his creed to do it often; and even in the few cases in which he did, the sophistry was too transparent to mislead any one. I do not believe he was conscious of it himself. He was happy in expressing a great deal in a short space. He generally plunged into the marrow of his subject at once. In this respect he evinced the impatience of a man who thought he could adduce arguments or facts which would at once set the question before the House at rest.

I have said that his manner was cold and inanimate. He usually stood stock still, with his right hand resting on the table, and talked as if addressing himself to some particular Peer on the opposite side. This of course applies to the speeches he has made since his ejection from the Woolsack. When Lord Chancellor, he always spoke from the floor, on

the left hand of the Woolsack, which was a considerable distance from the table.

Lord Eldon's political character does not altogether accord with his character as a Judge. In the latter capacity he was remarkable for the length of time he took to make up his mind, as he called it, on the merits of a case. He balanced the evidence for and against with so much care and nicety, and doubted and re-doubted so often, that the suitors on both sides often thought he would not give a decision till doomsday—at least not till their doomsday. On political questions, on the other hand, he never had a doubt at all. The very moment a point was presented to his mind, no matter how intricate its bearings, he gave judgment—and that too in the most decided terms. No one ever heard him in such a case say he was at a loss. He saw the thing clearly as soon as he saw it all.

A greater stickler for ancient usages and ancient institutions never lived. In his view, time hallowed every thing. The abuses which his own party admitted to exist, and which they said it was necessary to remedy, were as much consecrated in his eyes as those parts of the Constitution which, laying all irony aside, are really the envy of surrounding nations and the admiration of the world. “What-

ever is, is right," was his grand maxim in such cases. Not even the criminal code, sanguinary and anomalous as it was, ever had a single defect in his eye. He thought the slight amelioration effected in that code by the labours of his friend Sir Robert Peel, was a most daring and dangerous innovation on "existing institutions." Though the press, Tory as well as Liberal, and men of all parties in Parliament, denounced the "law's delay," and the other abuses in the Court of Chancery, he would never allow there was any thing wrong even there, nor that any improvement could be made.

His party often regretted this, because they saw it was productive of most injurious results to their cause; but he was one who would not yield an inch, or sanction the correction of what was manifestly to all other eyes a glaring abuse, be the consequences what they might. His notion was, that as the world must come to an end sometime, it would be much better to let it come any time, than that a single particle of what he considered part and parcel of Toryism should be given up. The great secret of Lord Eldon's most strenuous resistance to any alteration in whatever existed was, that he identified the abuses of every institution with the institution itself. To such an extent did he carry his reverence for ancient rights and usages, that he

always felt, when they were attacked, as if attacked himself. In fact, he would infinitely sooner that every species of abuse had been heaped in unmeasured quantities on himself, than that a word should be whispered against ancient usages and prescriptive rights; and often, while he showed no symptoms of uneasiness at violent attacks made on his own character did he evince great irritability when hidden abuses, especially if they were those of the Court of Chancery; were dragged to light and denounced.

However much one may censure his bigotry and intolerance, nobody can withhold his meed of approbation of the integrity and straightforwardness of his conduct. You saw the man exactly as he was constituted, before you heard him deliver a dozen sentences: I do not believe he would have stooped to any unworthy expedient, to accomplish any end, though he might have regarded detection as impossible. He was open as day in all his conduct—open to a fault in a politician.

Lord Eldon, during the last ten or fifteen years, has been remarkable for his venerable appearance. I have hardly ever seen a man whose personal aspect was more calculated to inspire respect. The expression of his countenance, which has a great deal of intelligence in it, has much of the gravity of the judge. The first impression of a

stranger on seeing him, would be that he is a man of a benevolent disposition, and of a deeply-seated religious feeling. There is an undefinable expression of dignity in his whole appearance, which at once strikes you when first within the reach of your eye. He is one of those men whose very look disarms an opponent of all power of personal or vituperative attack. In the mere personnel of the noble Lord, putting out of view the moral and intellectual qualities of his character, there is much to admire. He is tall, and well formed for one over whose head eighty-five years have past. His face is full, and of fair complexion, with much fewer wrinkles than might be expected in one who has not only advanced so far into the vale of life, but the greatest portion of whose existence has been spent amidst the storms of politics, and with all the cares of the highest judicial station in the country pressing on his mind. His features are generally large, but that which strikes one most is the sunken appearance of his eyes, caused by an unusually great projection of his eyebrows. His forehead is well developed. His hair is milk-white, while his head is but very partially bald. He appears in good health for one at his advanced age. His mind is as clear in its perceptions as ever, and he can express himself in correct and

vigorous language. For the reasons I have already mentioned, rather than from his accumulated years, he was not, so far as I observed, in his place in the House of Lords, all last Session.

The Earl of WICKLOW may be regarded as the leader of the Opposition, on all matters bearing immediately on the affairs of Ireland. He is a man of fair talents, but nothing more. He is clever in debate. There are few more voluble men in the House. Though of a warm temperament, and often irritated—for his severity on others leads to severity on their part in dealing with himself—he never allows himself to be confused or disconcerted by his loss of temper. He has always an ample stock of words at command, wherewith to make an effective attack on an antagonist, or to defend himself: and he is not only ready, but correct. His sentences are elegant, and his periods rounded. The worst of it is, there is infinitely more to admire in his diction than in his ideas. In the latter, indeed, there is often nothing at all worthy of the smallest admiration. You regret to see so much elegant language wasted on such worthless ideas. It is true he thinks very differently of his matter himself: that, no doubt, is all natural. Take his own estimate of his talents, and he has no equal, Lord Brougham alone excepted,

in the House. His extravagant notion of his abilities as a debater, is not without its advantages, both to himself and his party. It prompts him often to rush into the arena to vindicate Tory principles, and sustains him in the conflict, when others of his party, either from timidity or the want of the requisite pugnacity of disposition, stand aloof from it. Independently of an overweening confidence of his own powers, the noble Earl possesses much moral courage, from the deep and unwavering conviction he entertains of the truth and excellence of Conservative principles. He is not to be driven from the field under any circumstances. You cannot stun him by any blow you give him, however heavy, and however tender the part on which it alights. You may make him stagger, or even lay him prostrate at your feet, but you cannot scatter his senses. When you flatter yourself that all is over, that he is either lying inanimate or insensible before you, he starts again that moment to his feet, and renews the combat as actively and in as good spirits as ever. To be sure his thrusts, if they reach you at all, may have no more effect than the feeble pattings of a babe have on the person of its nurse. Still he is all vitality and all profusion in dealing out his thrusts at you ; fancying all the while, that ere he

sits down he will be able to lay you mangled and breathless on the scene of conflict, a spectacle of pity to your friends and of triumph to your enemies. In other words, you may suppose, and all the spectators may concur with you in the opinion, that you have signally vanquished, and for ever disabled, the noble Earl; but neither you nor they will convince him of that. He reverses your conclusions; he looks on it to be as clear as the noon-day sun, that you yourself are in the precise predicament in which you fancied him to be placed. Never yet did he retire from any conflict with a Liberal Peer, without shouting in his own mind the cry of victory.

The noble Earl is exemplary in his attendance on his parliamentary duties. Nothing but some obstacle of an insuperable kind will ever prevent his being in his place in Parliament when any question of importance is expected to be brought before the House. And on almost every such question he is sure to speak. His speeches are not, except in peculiar cases, long. They generally occupy from twenty to thirty minutes in the delivery.

I have said that he speaks with fluency. His voice is pleasant, and possesses considerable compass, but he wants the power of controuling or modulating it to such an extent as would make him an

effective speaker. There is hardly ever any variation from the key on which he pitches his voice. He begins rather loudly, and continues to the close as he began. There is much warmth in his manner. He is always animated. You are convinced he feels what he says—that the sentiments he expresses are the settled convictions of his mind. His gesture is generally violent; sometimes extravagant.

In person he is about the usual height, and of a very stout and compact make, without being, strictly speaking, corpulent. His features are regular; and his face, which is round, has something prepossessing about it. His complexion is fair, and his hair red. He appears to be in excellent health, and though in his forty-eighth year, you would not suppose he had attained the age of forty.

The Earl of LIMERICK is a nobleman with whose name the public have been familiar for many years past. Though now in the seventy-eighth year of his age, he is, perhaps, one of the most violent Tories in the House. It is his matter, however, and not his manner, that is thus distinguished for its ultraism. As a speaker he may be said to be mild and temperate; he speaks in so low a tone as to be sometimes inaudible to those at any distance from him. His gesture, too, is gentle and moderate. In

short, were one to judge only from the tones of his voice and his appearance generally, he would at once set the noble Earl down as a type of all that is mild and moderate. When, however, he perceives the quality of his matter, he will find out his mistake. His speeches breathe a singular bitterness of spirit towards those who hold opposite political opinions. Charity is said to cover a multitude of sins. The noble Earl has not a particle of this commodity towards those who differ from him. He is himself so entirely steeped in Toryism that he cannot, for the life of him, see how men can conscientiously entertain antagonist principles. That he himself is thoroughly convinced of the excellency of his opinions, no one, so far as I am aware, ever hinted a doubt. No one not perfectly sincere in his opinions could by possibility evince the intense zeal in their behalf which the noble Earl has done during a lengthened public life. He is not a man of much talent. I have never heard him make any speech which rose above mediocrity : usually he is rather below it. Until the present session he was in the habit of speaking on all party questions, and on those relating to the government of Ireland. He speaks indifferently well so far as the delivery is concerned, were it not, as already remarked, that his tone of voice becomes sometimes so low as to render him

barely audible. His style has none of the graces of literature. It is usually feeble and clumsy, sometimes incorrect.

In person, he is plain and country-like. He is of the middle height, and rather stoutly made. The colour of his hair is grey, and his complexion has much of the huc of health in it, considering his advanced age. His features are large and strongly marked. His cheek bones are high and prominent, and the expression of his face altogether is such that one who has seen him once would never afterwards be at a loss to distinguish him among all the other Peers in the House.

The Earl of WINCHILSEA is chiefly distinguished for his warm attachment to the Established Church, and his zealous advocacy of her interests. A more sincere or attached friend the Church of England does not possess. She is ever uppermost in his mind; every thing else dwindles into insignificance when compared with her. But with that church he mixes up every thing appertaining to her as she now exists. He regards her as perfection itself, and that any interference with her, though under the pretext of improving her, is nothing else than a blow aimed at her very being. Men may talk of abuses having crept into her as they please, he will not believe it. His own most intimate and attached political

friends admit that some improvement may be made in her mode of working, but he denies the fact. To touch her in any way, or under any pretext, is, in his view, the greatest moral crime which a human being can commit. The clergy, whether considered numerically or in their incomes, are, in his estimation, as essential a part of the church as the head is of a human body. He who would either diminish the number of the clergy to the extent of a single unit, however many of them may be perfect drones, or reduce their incomes by a single farthing, incurs a moral responsibility of the first magnitude. His speeches, in their printed form, breathe an ardour of attachment to the church and clergy which is not to be seen in the speeches of any other member of the Upper House—with perhaps the single exception of those of Lord Roden—but no one can form an adequate conception of the intensity of that attachment who has not heard him speak. It is only in the emphasis of his words, the tone of his voice, and the warmth and energy of his manner, that you can see his friendship for the church and clergy in all its strength and fulness. I believe he would make greater sacrifices for the Church of England and her ministers, than almost any other man alive at this moment. That church is dear to him as his own life. Rather than see the Appropriation Ques-

tion carried, as respects that portion of the Protestant Establishment which is in Ireland, he would, I have no doubt, not only sacrifice the whole of his estates, but cheerfully suffer martyrdom. I heard him state—and he did so with an emphasis and energy of manner which could leave no room to doubt the sincerity of the feeling expressed—I heard him state, last session, that he would rather sacrifice his entire estates, than see the Municipal Corporation Reform Bill receive the sanction of the Lords. If he said this in reference to that measure, those who know how much more intensely he feels on all questions immediately affecting the church than he does on subjects purely political, can have no hesitation in concurring in the opinion I have just expressed, that he would most willingly suffer martyrdom any day in defence of that church as she now exists. It was, I have no doubt, the conviction that if he should be killed in the duel which he fought with the Duke of Wellington in 1829, that he would die a martyr to his attachment to the church, and in the assertion of her rights and interests, that he accepted the challenge of the noble Duke rather than retract what he had said of him as an enemy of the church. It was the same feeling that prompted the resolution he then formed, and to

which he adhered for some time,—till more mature deliberation suggested he might be of greater service to the church in his place in Parliament—never to enter the House again because it had sanctioned the measure of Catholic Emancipation.

The ardour of the noble Earl's attachment to the Church of England, constituted as she is at present, often leads him to say many foolish things, and to make many foolish exhibitions, in the House of Lords. Many of his observations, from their sheer extravagance and utter absence of any thing like rationality, have never been reported, at least not as they have fallen from his lips, and are consequently unknown to the public. Some of his printed epistles "to the Protestants of England," have appeared, even to his own most intimate friends, as well as the most strenuous supporters of the Church, so deeply tinged with fanaticism, as to defeat the very objects they had in view; but these, in the quality of extravagance, do not admit of a moment's comparison with some of the effusions which escape him in the Lords. The intensity of his feelings gets the complete mastery over his judgment, and he allows himself to be worked up to such a pitch of excitement, that he is perfectly unconscious at the time of what he is saying. I believe that more dis-

interested genuine zeal for the Church of England burns in his bosom than is felt by the whole Bench of Bishops, taken in the aggregate.

The noble Earl never speaks except on subjects on which he feels strongly : on other topics he never opens his mouth. It will consequently be readily believed, that his manner is warm and violent in no ordinary degree. Of him it may be said with peculiar force and propriety, " Out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh ! " He throws his whole soul into his words. Never did the most zealous and energetic clergyman that ever existed, when addressing his fellow-beings on the most soul-stirring topics that could be brought before their minds, manifest a greater earnestness of manner. The intensity of his feelings sometimes prevents the due enunciation of his words. He is occasionally, you would fancy, like to choke from the exertion he gives his lungs, and his impatience to deliver his sentiments. His voice is clear and strong, and might be modulated with great effect ; but the ardour of his feelings does not admit of his paying the slightest attention to the graces of elocution. His action is vehement, without being so redundant as might be supposed from the intensity with which he feels on all those questions on which he addresses the House. He never speaks long,

and hardly ever attempts anything in the shape of argument. His speeches consist of declamation from first to last. Their burthen almost invariably is, that if the measure he opposes be suffered to pass the House, that House will not only utterly and irretrievably disgrace itself—he scruples not in such cases at the terms he employs—but will destroy the Constitution, and introduce revolution into the land.

The noble Earl is not a person of any vigour or grasp of mind: nor is his style at all entitled to praise. Even his written addresses, already referred to, are poor indeed, considered merely as literary compositions. They are penned in defiance of the most plain and simple rules of syntax. His sentences, as Hamlet says of the times, are “sadly out of joint.”

Still the Earl of Winchilsea is a man whom everybody, however much one may differ from him, must respect. His motives are most pure where his judgment is most at fault. His private character is irreproachable: in all the relations of life he is most exemplary. If there were no other honest man in the House of Lords—though there are many on both sides—he is emphatically one. Those blandishments of place and power which would make many others change every prin-

ciple they have, and induce them to adopt the very opposite class of opinions, would not have the effect of causing him to compromise any of his in the slightest degree.

In person he is tall and stout. His face, without being corpulent, has a tendency to the rotund conformation. His complexion is dark, and his hair black. His features are small and regular, and the expression of his countenance altogether is that of dignity blended with pleasantness. He is in the forty-fifth year of his age, though, judging from his hale and healthy appearance, you would not think him so far advanced in life*.

Lord RODEN contests with the Earl of Winchelsea the title of the Champion of the Church. If the zeal of both these noblemen for the Protestant Establishment be on a par, and if they be alike blind as to the faults and failings which others of her more enlightened friends discover in

* A short time since, I had occasion to travel nearly fifty miles in a stage-coach with Lord Maidstone, son of the noble Earl. This young nobleman promises to distinguish himself in public life. Like his father, he is devotedly attached to the Church of England; but in his advocacy of her interests there is great calmness and moderation in his manner. His information is at once varied and profound, and his powers of conversation great, though only in his twentieth year. He is a young nobleman of a remarkably mild and affable disposition.

her, the parallel holds equally good as to their talents. The intellectual powers of Lord Roden, like those of the Earl of Winchilsea, are below mediocrity. In the article of discretion—at least in so far as the advocacy of the Church is concerned—Lord Roden has a slight advantage over his noble friend. He does not allow his feelings to obtain so entire a mastery over him, though on church matters, next to the Earl of Winchilsea, he evinces the most ardent temperament of any man in the House. His speeches are never illumined by the faintest gleam of argument: he seems to hold all reasoning in supreme disdain. His addresses to the House consist almost exclusively of bitter lamentations at the profligacy and impiety of that innovating spirit which is abroad, mingled with a liberal allowance of denunciations of noble Lords on the other side, for abetting this revolutionary and infidel spirit. He never speaks long at a time: it is impossible that he could; for his stock of declamation and anathemas being limited to the single point of an apprehended destruction of the church, coupled with the singing of a sort of dirge suited for the dire catastrophe, it were out of the question to expect he could continue any length of time without unprofitable repetitions; of which, by the way, there are a reasonable number. Then again, there

are physical obstacles to long speeches on the part of the noble Lord, which of themselves would of necessity speedily bring his oratory to a close, supposing the extent of his mental resources were incomparably greater than it is. The extreme vehemence of his manner, in one whose person is so stout as to approach to corpulency, would soon fatigue him to perfect exhaustion.

He is all sound and fury. His voice, which is naturally good, though his peculiar opinions and the warmth of his feelings have imparted to it something of a melancholy, if not a whining tone,—is raised to a high pitch, and his gesture is redundant in the extreme. He works himself up to a degree of animal excitement which is in admirable keeping with the rhapsodical character of his matter. He is as happy an illustration as one could wish to meet with, of the old adage, that empty barrels make the greatest noise. In the seriousness of his aspect, the gravity of his tones, and in his manner altogether, he strongly reminds one of those preachers of the gospel whose zeal borders on fanaticism, if it have not lost itself in it. It was a mistake in his destiny when he missed the Church. He would never have made a brilliant Bishop, he is too deficient in intellect for that; but I doubt not he would have been a very useful one. It

were well if a portion of his zeal were infused into some of his friends on the Bench of Bishops. If he have too much of this commodity, they have too little. His blind zeal causes him to apprehend dangers to the "Protestant religion as by law established" where none exist; the indifference of some of the Right Rev. Prelates—there are exceptions undoubtedly—has the effect of making them repose in indolence and security, where there is both actual and imminent danger. Lord Roden may be censured for his imprudence, and the more enlightened friends of the Establishment may complain with justice of the injury which the ardour of his feelings, uncontrouled as it is by anything deserving the name of judgment, has done to the cause so near and dear to his heart, but every one must respect him for the purity of his motives and the integrity of his conduct.

Dr. Johnson, as I have remarked in sketching the character of another member, was fond of a good hater. Had the Earl of Roden been contemporary with the great lexicographer, he must have been an especial favourite with him for the cordiality with which the noble Earl hates the Roman Catholics. It is right, however, to add, that it is not themselves personally he hates; he hates them only as the representatives of the Roman Catholic

faith. Let them renounce their errors, and embrace the Protestantism of the Establishment, and they will, that moment, be transformed from objects of the bitterest dislike to objects of the warmest affection. Of all religious creeds in the world, the Roman Catholic creed is to him the most obnoxious. I question whether he does not view it in a more unfavourable light than he does Paganism or even Infidelity itself.

Lord Roden is in the prime of life, being in his forty-eighth year. He is one of the tallest and stoutest men in the House. He is good-looking. His features are large but regular, and his face is of the oval form. His complexion is dark, and his hair is something between a brown and a black colour. He wears large whiskers. He appears to be in excellent health.

The Earl of ABERDEEN's manner of speaking, as well as the matter of his speeches, contrasts strikingly with the well-known ultraism of his Tory principles. He is calm and quiet, even to lifelessness, in all his addresses to the House. A person who heard him speak, and did not know who he was, would at once say in his own mind, "This is a man who speaks, as the proverb says, for speaking's sake, and who cares nothing about the principles he professes to entertain." The cold

and monotonous tones of his voice are quite in keeping with his action,—if, indeed, the occasional gentle raising and lowering of his right hand merit the name. The moment he gets on his legs you would think him fairly transfixed to the spot on which he stands. Scarcely more inanimate in appearance is the statue of the late Mr. Canning, which faces Palace Yard on your way to the House. His voice is clear, and not unpleasant, but he always begins, continues, and ends his speeches in precisely the same key. His speaking has this redeeming quality, that everything he says is audible. Nor must I omit to mention that his articulation is good. He also times his utterance with judgment. He neither speaks too rapidly nor too slow: if there be a tendency to either fault, it is to the latter. His language is always correct; I am not sure that there are many speakers in either House who can boast of a more classically accurate style in their speeches. He speaks extempore, and always with much ease. If you are not struck with the comprehensiveness of his views, the originality of his ideas, or the ingeniousness of his arguments, you can never, with justice, impute anything absolutely weak or silly to him. He is always clear. Even in the most intricate and difficult-to-be-understood topics of our foreign policy, which, indeed,

are almost the only subjects on which he ever addresses the House, you can at all times follow him without an effort. His arguments are generally more plausible in themselves, than ingeniously or forcibly put. He is a man of respectable information on most of the questions which come before the House; but with questions of foreign policy he is particularly conversant. This may be accounted for from the circumstance of his having filled, for a considerable time, the office of Secretary for Foreign Affairs. The noble Earl is favourably known in the literary world. His work on the Antiquities of Athens is one which could only have emanated from the pen of a man of taste and intelligence. His perception of the beautiful in architecture is perhaps unequalled by that of any man in the present day—certainly by that of any man moving in the higher spheres of society.

I cannot say as much of his taste in the science, as some people call it, of dress. He dresses with much carelessness. No one would believe his coat was ever intended for him; or, if so, the fair inference would be, that his tailor dispenses, in his case, with the usual admeasurements in cutting the cloth. Never was coat made in more utter contempt of the Brummell notion of tailorifics, than is that of the noble Earl. One of its most re-

markable features is the amplitude of its dimensions. Snip, if one may hazard an hypothesis, must be dreaming of some well-fed Alderman, when he puts the scissors in requisition. The negligence of his apparel makes him look at least of the age of sixty, though his antiquity is less than that by eight years.

In person he is about the middle height, and of corresponding stoutness. His features are regular and pleasing. His face is something between the round and oblong form. His complexion is dark, and the colour of his hair approaches to a jet black. In the general expression of his countenance there is nothing striking. It conveys the idea, perhaps, of serenity mingled with a slight absence of mind, more than of any other quality.

The Earl of HADDINGTON has always been a nobleman of some importance in the House: since he filled the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, that importance has considerably increased. He does not, however, speak often. When he does address the House, it is chiefly on Scottish or Irish topics. He has contributed, though nothing could have been farther from his intention, more than any other man I know of, to advance the cause of Reform in Scotland; rather, perhaps, I should

say, he has been the chief instrument in calling forth expressions of public opinion on that point, from that part of the country.

He profited not by the lesson taught the Duke of Wellington in 1829, of the danger of making incautious declarations. When the first Reform Bill was under discussion, the Earl of Haddington, in his place in the House of Peers, took upon himself to assure their Lordships that the people of Scotland were not in favour of Reform; an assumption which he professedly grounded on the fact of their not having sent up petitions to Parliament on the subject. His observation had the effect of throwing all Scotland into an instantaneous flame on the subject. It aroused the Reformers in all parts of the country, from that philosophic coolness characteristic of the people on the other side the Tweed, and caused them to come openly and boldly forward to demonstrate what their views and feelings on the subject were. It did more than this: it gave such an impetus to the Reform cause, that myriads, who before would have considered themselves disgraced by the application of the term Reformers to them, now began to glory in it; and earnestly to contend with their oldest and most tried friends in the country, in their anxiety to give a practical refutation

of Lord Haddington's statement, by attending public meetings, and affixing their signatures to petitions to the Legislature for Reform. Without, therefore, intending it, the noble Earl gave a new and unheard-of impetus to the cause, by the ill-advised declaration to which I have referred. He soon saw the error he had committed, and he deeply regretted it; but there was no possibility of remedying the evil. He should have known his countrymen better. He should have known that the fact of their silence on any given subject is by no means a proof that they are indifferent to that subject.

The noble Earl is a man of respectable talents: higher praise he certainly does not on this account deserve. But even were his ideas better than they are, they would lose much of their effect from his cold and inanimate manner of delivery. There is no life or vitality at all about him when addressing the House. His words fall from his lips as if coming from those of a piece of statuary. He is one of the prosiest speakers in the House. You never see, in anything he says or does, the slightest indication of feeling. His style is diffuse: it is correct, without being polished. It wants terseness: it has, however, the merit of always being clear. His voice is, if any thing, feeble. He does

not speak in a loud tone, but sufficiently so to be heard in all parts of the House. His utterance is rather slow, but he speaks with seeming ease. He seldom stammers, or seems at a loss for his words. If he were as well circumstanced as to good ideas, he would be of more service to his party. As to his gesture, it will have been inferred, from what has been already said, that he has very little. You never see him make use of any other than a very slight movement of his right arm. He never speaks long at a time; and his speeches excite but little attention. His Toryism is sufficiently ultra, but his good sense, and especially his phlegmatic temperament, prevent his making those foolish exhibitions which so often characterise the oratorical efforts of Lords Winchilsea, Roden, Londonderry, &c.

The noble Earl is, in his personal appearance, slightly above the middle size. He is thin and sparely made, with a sallow complexion, and hair of a dark grey colour. His features have nothing particularly expressive in them. Their general expression is that of a somewhat thoughtful austerity of mind. He is not yet far advanced in life, being only in his forty-sixth year.

The Earl of HARROWBY, owing to his advanced age—he is in his seventy-fourth year—has not spoken

very frequently of late in his place in the House of Lords; but whenever he does speak, he invariably commands the attention of all present. Independently of the respect which could not fail to be paid to his talents, the circumstance of his having for so many years filled a very important office—that of President of the Council in the Ministry of Lord Liverpool—would necessarily ensure, to a considerable extent, the attention of the House. There is something, too, in his very appearance calculated to win the respectful opinion of all who see him. In height, he is slightly above the middle size, with an inclination to stoutness. His hair exhibits, in a striking manner, the whitening effects of time; and in the whole of his appearance you see something strongly indicative of advanced age, while at the same time you miss most of the symptoms of physical infirmity with which it is generally accompanied. For a man of his years, he may be considered strong and healthy. His appearance has much of the gentleman in it: his countenance has a grave and dignified aspect, without any thing of the haughtiness of the aristocrat. His complexion is something between dark and pale. The form of his face is oblong: his features are regular, but are somewhat strongly marked, owing to his advanced years. His eye is quick, and has an intelligent

expression. As a speaker, he cannot be said to rank high ; but he always acquits himself, when he does address the House, in a very respectable manner. When a member of Lord Liverpool's Administration, he spoke often, and, as might be expected, much more effectively than he does now. His voice is still good, and there is considerable earnestness in his manner ; always, indeed, as much as must satisfy every one that he speaks from conviction, and that his principles are dear to him. His matter wants depth, but it always bears directly on the question before the House. He excels in giving in a short compass the marrow of the arguments which may be urged in favour of the view of the question which is taken by noble Lords on his side of the House. He reasons fairly, as well as closely : he never seeks to defeat an opponent by mere dexterity : his notion seems to be, that if the cause he espouses cannot be defended on its real merits, it is not worth defending at all. He never, however, for one moment doubts that all the justice and truth are on the side of Toryism. But it is right to add, that he is by no means one of the most ultra Tories : his judgment is too sound for that : he is a nobleman of much shrewdness of mind, and never commits himself so far as to make foolish exhibitions, like those so often made by two or three other noble

Lords. He speaks with ease; he never seems at a loss either for ideas or words: only that his ideas are not of a commanding order, nor is his diction eloquent; it is not, however, on the other hand, feeble or incorrect: it has the merit of blending together, in a very respectable measure, the qualities of strength and clearness. He seldom attends the House when matters of only inferior importance are expected to come on: when, however, any great question is to be brought before it, he is invariably to be found in his place, unless prevented by serious indisposition.

Lord ROSSLYN's advanced years have not abated his zeal in the cause of Toryism. It is true that, as might be expected in one who has attained the age of seventy-four, he is not physically so active in its favour, but he still feels as strong an interest in its fortunes as ever. He still continues, on all occasions, when party spirit runs high, or when any question of importance is before the House, to act as the whipper-in of the Tories. He was never, even in his best days, a man of much talent: it is hardly necessary to say, that his intellectual powers have not grown more vigorous with his growth in years. He still speaks occasionally; but his party would be as well pleased if he were to remain mute: their cause gains nothing by his advocacy. He is a very

indifferent speaker; his voice is feeble; he wants mere physical strength to make himself audible: nor has his manner any thing to recommend it; it is heavy and spiritless; while, as may be inferred from what I have stated already, his matter has nothing in it of a redeeming character.

The noble Lord stoops, from the weight of his years. He is tall, but slenderly made. There is much of the appearance of physical feebleness about him. His face is thin, and his features are long and strongly marked. His hair is grey; his forehead is entirely bald. You can distinguish him from all the other Peers, by the singularity of his dress: no matter what be the season of the year, you always see a white handkerchief around his Lordship's neck. Whether he ever wore a black, or green, or brown coat, is a question I am unable to answer; but I have never seen him with any other than a blue one. His waistcoat and trousers are always light, and you might as soon expect to see him without legs, as without top-boots. He is still, notwithstanding his advanced age, and its accompanying infirmities, wonderfully regular in his attendance on his legislative duties.

The Earl of MANSFIELD, though formerly in the habit of addressing the House with some frequency, has not spoken much of late years. This is not

to be wondered at in one over whose head have passed sixty years. The lapse of this lengthened period has left visible traces on his person. His hair is quite grey, and his sallow countenance, which has a placid expression, exhibits a goodly number of wrinkles. He is rather above the ordinary height, and well-proportioned for a man of his advanced years.

As a speaker he usually acquits himself in a highly creditable manner. His voice is good: it has great clearness, blended with much depth and fulness of tone. His diction is easy and flowing, and his matter is always considerably above mediocrity. Sometimes you would feel inclined to rank him among second-rate speakers. He always, however, makes set speeches: he knows he would make no figure at extemporaneous addresses, and has the good sense not to attempt it. Usually, both his matter and manner are temperate. Occasionally, however, he breaks out into what some persons call an oratorical fury, when there is always a manifest preponderance of sound over sense. In the debate on the Irish Tithes Bill, in August 1834, he made an edifying exhibition of this kind. In a "set" speech, which occupied nearly an hour in the delivery, he abused Ministers in most unmeasured terms. Their acts were "discreditable,"

and themselves “degraded.” “The bestowal of a patent of precedency on O’Connell was a premium on agitation ; it was a bribe to him not to submit himself to the law, which no one but himself could violate with impunity.” And then, after holding them up in this light, he lowered his tone, and with the most perfect coolness and gravity expressed a hope that he had not said anything in the heat of debate, or on the impulse of the moment, which could annoy his Majesty’s Ministers. Lord M^elbourne afterwards observed, in reference to this remark, with a bitterness of irony which those only who heard the observation could fully perceive, “that he might make himself quite easy as to the annoyance he had given his Majesty’s Ministers. As to the heat of debate and the impulse of the moment, they were only rhetorical artifices, for it was clear that every sentence he uttered must have cost him a month’s labour.” Lord Brougham reproved the noble Earl for his violent effusion in very severe terms. He said, “he had digressed into every topic a ransacked memory could supply, from mere personal hostility towards Ministers ; and that his speech altogether exceeded any notion he had ever formed of the lengths to which party animosity could carry individuals.” I allude more particularly to this speech of the noble Earl,

because it is the only one of importance he has made for some years, and because he has never, but once, opened his mouth in the House since. Indeed, he is now but seldom to be seen in his place in Parliament; nothing but a question of great importance calls him forth from the retirement of private life.

CHAPTER IX.

TORY PARTY.—BARONS.

LORD WYNFORD — LORD LYNTHURST — LORD ELLENBOROUGH — LORD FITZGERALD AND VESSEY—LORD ASHBURTON—LORD ABINGER—LORD WHAENCLIFFE—LORD KENYON.

LORD WYNFORD, from his age, politics, and the judicial situations he has filled, naturally claims at our hands the first notice under this head. Like the Earl of Eldon, Lord Wynford earned for himself, before he had been long at the bar, a distinguished reputation as a lawyer; but he is undoubtedly, in this respect, inferior to the other. He is a man of good talents, and is most decidedly attached to Toryism; but he never has acquired the weight of character or influence with his party, of which Lord Eldon could always boast. There was a sturdiness in the Toryism of the latter, and a boldness and energy in his defence of it, which were peculiar to himself. Lord Wynford's mind is remarkably clear in its conceptions, and he is

equally clear in the expression of his sentiments. There is no possibility of mistaking the point to which he is directing you ; and, so far as your judgment is concerned, he takes the best road in conducting you to it. Still you feel disposed to linger on your journey, or return altogether, because you do not like his company. His matter and manner are equally unattractive. He never strikes you by anything original or ingenious ; nor does he enliven you with anything amusing. His speeches are as correctly argued as if he were giving judgment in a case in a court of law, on which the evidence was all on one side : they are also as dry and tedious. His mind is deficient in vigour. He never strikes out any new path for himself ; but he will marshal with much tact, and place before your mind's eye, the best arguments which would suggest themselves to a man of sound judgment. On his side of the question, I know few men in either House who can communicate, with greater ease and precision to others, the arguments which have occurred to his own mind on any question before their Lordships.

He possesses considerable moral courage. He often attacks the positions of Lord Brougham, when others on his side of the House would be deterred from the task by a fear of the furious

retaliation of that noble Lord. He does not, however, excel in reply: his forte consists in delivering a speech, embracing arguments and facts which would have occurred to him before he entered the House.

His mind, as may be inferred from what has just been stated, is unfitted for grappling with great questions. I have often thought he appeared to greater advantage on subjects of minor importance, than on those of overwhelming magnitude. The best speech I ever heard him make—and it is probably the best he ever did make since he was raised to the Peerage in 1829—was in 1834, in opposition to Lord Brougham's Local Courts Jurisdiction Bill. The fact was, that the question was one which was not only from his previous studies peculiarly familiar to his mind, but it was one on which he felt very strongly. What, too, must have stimulated him to an unusual effort on that occasion, was the certain knowledge that the opposition to that measure, which was led by him, would prove successful, and be permanently destructive of the Bill.

Lord Wynford's manner is ever the same. He has no action, nor ever betrays the least warmth of feeling. A slight movement of the right arm is all the gesture he ever uses. His voice is always

pitched in the same key, be the subject what it may, or whatever be his facts or arguments. His voice is clear and pleasant, but wants power. His utterance is rapid and fluent. He never hesitates a moment, nor has occasion to correct himself. He is quite a mechanical speaker; if he gain your attention in the outset, he is sure to lose it, from his inanimate manner, before he has proceeded far.

He is a Nobleman of excellent private character, and has no personal enemies in public life. He never indulges in personalities, but speaks always in the most courteous language of those who differ from him. The only Peer who attacks him in any other than the most gentlemanly strain, is Lord Brougham. I have mentioned, in the sketch I have given of the latter Nobleman, a striking instance of the violence of his attacks on Lord Wynford. Another was afforded in the same Session of 1834, when Lord Wynford brought in a Bill for the better Observance of the Sabbath.

Lord Wynford has a remarkable flow of animal spirits, considering his advanced age—sixty-nine—and the physical infirmity under which he has laboured for some years. He is always cheerful—almost always, indeed, smiling.

He is a decided partisan. He hates the bare idea of Liberalism. His zeal for his own views

and party formerly induced him to speak often. Until the last Session, you hardly ever missed him from his seat : during that Session he was hardly ever in the House. I am not sure that he made one speech worthy of the name from the beginning to the end of it.

The bodily infirmity under which he labours, and to which I have just referred, is one of a very serious nature. It has had the effect of making him stoop to such a degree as to give his body quite a diagonal appearance. It is with great difficulty he can walk at all ; and then only as on one side, and by taking six or eight steps where one would suffice for another. Before he was visited with his bodily infirmity, he was about the usual height, and rather stoutly made. His features are well formed, and his face, which is oval, has all the appearance of good health. It has no wrinkles in it, nor has his head any symptom of even incipient baldness. His hair, like Lord Eldon's, is white. His forehead is high and well formed, but the general expression of his countenance is that of good-nature and simplicity, rather than of intelligence.

I now come to speak of by far the ablest man on the Tory side of the House—and the ablest man, unquestionably, with the single exception of Lord

Brougham, in it. It will be at once perceived that I point to Lord LYNDHURST. As a judge, he is, perhaps, surpassed by no one who ever sat on the Bench; few, indeed, in this respect, have ever equalled him. At an early age he gave ample earnest of that distinction to which, in a country like this, his talents could not fail to raise him. That he was fitted, both by his natural ability and his varied attainments in politics and literature, to shine in the senate as he was then shining at the Bar, and as he especially shone in private conversation,—was early discovered by the late Lord Liverpool, or by some of his friends. The result of the discovery was an offer, in 1821, on the part of the noble Lord, to bring Lord Lyndhurst, then Mr. John Singleton Copley, into Parliament, for Ashburton, one of the nomination burghs. The offer, after some hesitation, was accepted, and the noble Lord became a Member of the Lower House, where he soon acquitted himself in such a way as fully to realise the expectations of those who sent him thither. A great deal of controversy has lately taken place as to the particular class of political opinions which Lord Lyndhurst entertained immediately before his election as a Member of Parliament. It is affirmed by his opponents, that he was a red-hot Republican. He himself denies,

in the most decided terms, that he ever was so. That he did in early life, and up to that time, entertain liberal political principles, is a fact which admits of no dispute. But in the absence of positive proof, and in the face of his solemn unequivocal disclaimer of his ever having held Republican opinions, it is not fair to charge him with having been an enemy to monarchical government. Probably the suspicion of his having embraced Republican principles in early life, arose, in a great measure, from his having been born under a Republican government. He is a native of America, whence he came over to this country, in early life, with his father, who was a portrait painter, and who settled in Great Britain, in the hope of bettering his circumstances. His hopes were more than realised. He succeeded so well in his profession as to enable him to give to his son the best education England could afford. Mr. Copley was originally destined for the church, and, with the view of entering into Holy Orders, became a member of Trinity College, Cambridge. As, however, he soon afterwards gave up all idea of applying himself to the discharge of clerical duties, he only retained his degree seven years.

Perhaps few men have more suddenly raised themselves from the depths of obscurity to the

heights of distinction, than the noble Lord. In 1813 he was made Serjeant-at-Law. In 1818 he was raised to the office of Chief Justice of Chester. On the first day of Hilary Term in the following year, he took his seat within the Bar as one of his Majesty's Counsel. His great talents and extensive legal knowledge were perceived and duly appreciated by the Judges and the Bar in the Courts of Law in which he practised; but he was comparatively unknown to the public, until, in conjunction with Sir Charles, then Mr. Wetherell, he made his memorable and successful defence of the elder Watson, arraigned for high treason. Hitherto his practice had been but limited: after that time briefs poured in on him from every class of litigants, and from all parts of the country. The Radicals of that day contributed in no small degree to keep up the reputation which by that great effort he had acquired; for many weeks after, the walls of the Metropolis, and all large towns, were placarded with his name as the triumphant counsel of Watson; and his health was drunk with rapturous applause at every public dinner at which the Reformers of that period met to advance their principles. In the year last mentioned, 1819, Mr. Copley was appointed Solicitor-General, in which capacity he had a few months afterwards to

appear for the Government in the prosecution against Queen Caroline. He was created Attorney-General in 1824. In 1826 he succeeded Lord Gifford as Master of the Rolls ; and in 1827 he was raised to the highest elevation a subject can attain : he was appointed Lord Chancellor.

I have thus referred to the rapidity of Lord Lyndhurst's rise from obscurity to the distinction he now enjoys, because it furnishes so striking a proof of the greatness of his talents. He is possessed of extensive information. Perhaps his knowledge is more varied than profound. As a lawyer he is equally distinguished for the variety and depth of his attainments.

The noble Lord is distinguished above all men I ever knew for his acuteness in detecting the weaknesses or absurdities of his opponents. If they do make a slip, no matter however imperceptible to others, his lynx-eye is sure to detect it at once. Nor is he less happy in exposing the fallacies or blunders he discovers. He makes them as obvious to the minds of others as they are to his own. In this respect he stands unrivalled. Lord Brougham is as far inferior to him here, as he is his superior in comprehensiveness of mind, amplitude of illustration, and force of language.

Lord Lyndhurst is one of the most ingenious

sophists that ever belonged to either House of Parliament. The very quality of mind which enables him, as by a sort of intuition, to detect at the first glance the sophistries, however specious, of others, makes him a perfect master of the plausibilities himself. I have known him, where, *à priori*, you would have thought it impossible for the utmost ingenuity of the human mind to make out even a feasible case, weave together, with the greatest manifest ease, as if the natural suggestions of his mind, a series of such ingenious sophistries, that you could not detect even the semblance of a flaw in them.—Your convictions are as strong as ever that your original view of the question is the right one, and yet you feel your utter incapacity to meet the arguments—for such they appear to you—by which the noble Lord supports the opposite side: you are not convinced, but you are effectually silenced. The ingenuity and ability with which he vindicated the various alterations he caused to be made last Session in the Municipal Corporation Reform Bill, were the admiration of every noble Lord in the House. Those on the opposite side of the House—and I believe I may add, most of those on his own side also—could scarcely credit the evidence of their ears when they heard him, by a chain of the most specious sophisms, contend that

the alterations which he had made in the bill were in exact accordance with the avowed intentions of the framers of the measure. They doubtless felt that this was a fallacious assumption, and they must also have felt that it was supported by fallacies, yet they did not—because they were convinced they could not, with equal ability—meet and expose those fallacies, one by one, in the order in which he had adduced them.

It is only, however, when solid argument cannot be made available to his side of the question that he has recourse to sophistry. When fair argument can be urged, no man can press it into his service with better effect. In such cases he is clear, close, and severely logical beyond any man I know in either House. Every thing he says bears strictly on the question at issue, and in favour of his view of it, and he omits nothing that can be made to tell with effect on it. He exhausts the leading arguments that can be urged for his view of the matter, without employing any that are feeble or unnecessary.

Lord Lyndhurst's manner is most insinuating. There is usually something so seductive in it, that if you are not specially on your guard, you are sure to be led astray. No one would ever infer, from any thing he says or does, that he has in his com-

position the smallest particle of the partisan. You would think on all occasions that the particular view he takes of a question is solely the result of disinterested, unbiassed conviction. In all he says, and in his manner of saying it, there is every appearance of sincerity. You would at once set him down as a lover of truth for its own sake. I am far from meaning to insinuate that he does not love truth for its own sake, or that he is not sincere in his political opinions. It is but charitable to presume he is so on all points of importance; but, like most other men on both sides of the House, he is often obliged to view questions with the eye of a partisan, and to have recourse to sophisms where legitimate arguments are not within his reach. In most other men, the partisan and the sophist are too transparent to be mistaken; in the case of Lord Lyndhurst they are scarcely ever so. You are satisfied, as I have just said, that in him all is the result of honest conviction—that party considerations have never been allowed to weigh one atom in the conclusions to which he has come, nor have had any thing to do with the course of conduct he pursues.

Lord Lyndhurst is a nobleman of the most perfect coolness and self-possession. I never yet knew an instance in which an opponent disconcerted him, or elicited from him any ebullition of passion. He

is always as cool and collected as if he had not a particle of feeling or passion in his nature. Even on those great and absorbing questions which agitate all other bosoms, he invariably maintains the utmost calmness and composure. His clear and musical voice is never raised, though it manifestly has ample compass, to anything like a loud or indignant or energetic tone, nor did any one ever yet witness in him anything approaching to vehement gesture. Seldom, indeed, does he use any gesture at all, farther than a very gentle movement of his right arm. He speaks in that calm and collected tone which you might expect in one who was addressing an audience of ladies, and who was afraid of giving utterance to any thing which might grate on their ears, or in the slightest degree agitate their gentle bosoms. Not even the most violent and furious attacks of his great enemy, Lord Brougham, can betray him into a loss of temper. I have seen him quite cool and seemingly indifferent while Lord Brougham has been pouring out on him his most virulent vituperation, and I have also seen him rise up and ably repel those attacks without affording the slightest indication of an irritated temper.

It is not to be inferred from this, that Lord Lyndhurst is either deficient in political feeling, or insensible to personalities. No man is more de-

cided in his opinions, or more attached to them and his party; neither is any one more alive to personal attack. His apparent coolness on the one hand, and his indifference on the other, are doubtless the result of a severe course of self-discipline, to which he subjected himself in early life. A man of his great shrewdness must have perceived, before his appearance on the theatre of public affairs, the immense advantages which self-possession, and apparent coolness and indifference under attack, give to one who has to take part in the conflict of politics,—over an opponent; and therefore the noble Lord determined to repress every symptom of warmth of political feeling or sensitiveness to personal attack. Last Session he furnished some wonderful instances of this. The substitution of the Peel for the Melbourne Ministry, at the commencement of the Session, and the discussions on the Municipal Corporation Reform Bill, at a later period, gave to the personal attacks of Lord Brougham, on the noble Lord, an unusual degree of virulence and furiousness. Lord Lyndhurst, however, to the great annoyance of Lord Brougham, bore them all with the most imperturbable equanimity. At the same time, he took special care to return the blows of his deadly enemy with equal effect, though with infinitely less apparent energy.

On the very first night of the communications and explanations respecting the ejection of the Melbourne Administration, he hit Lord Brougham some hard blows, and yet seemingly in the coolest manner, in return for a fierce attack which the latter nobleman had that evening made on him. He pronounced it to be the flippant attack of a flippant person, and went on, without mincing his words, but with the most perfect coolness, to give him blow after blow. until, after writhing in his seat till he could no longer endure it, he rose up and called out, "Order, order!" There was something amusing in this, as the only person who had the right of correcting any one who trespassed against the rules of the House was the noble Lord himself who, as Lord Brougham conceived, was guilty of such violation. This was like appealing from Lord Lyndhurst, as the person speaking at the time, to Lord Lyndhurst, as the Lord Chancellor. The noble Lord, however, heeded not the appeal: regardless of Lord Brougham's exclamations, he proceeded with the same ease and equanimity of manner in the work of retaliation as when his opponent first interrupted him.

Lords Lyndhurst and Brougham regard each other with feelings of the most decided dislike. They regard themselves as rivals, not in reputation

and talent only, but for office. Lord Lyndhurst's great delight is to watch the every movement of any importance of his opponent, and to annoy him at every step. Lord Brougham is more afraid of the attacks of Lord Lyndhurst than of those of all the three hundred and fifty Peers on the opposite side of the House. The latter hardly ever attacks any one but Lord Brougham.

Lord Lyndhurst excels, when he chooses to indulge in it, in quiet irony. Nothing can be more galling to his opponent than some of his ironical observations. In the course of one of the discussions on the Municipal Corporation Reform Bill, last Session, the noble Lord made one of the happiest hits in this way I have ever witnessed. After castigating his rival in terms of no ordinary severity, he all at once assumed an air of special friendliness to him, and begged to introduce to his notice some passages from a pamphlet by a seemingly very respectable sort of personage, called Isaac Tomkins. As I quote from memory, I cannot give the particular phraseology which the noble Lord employed on the occasion, but it was ironically felicitous in the highest degree, and elicited bursts of laughter from both sides of the House.

As a tactician, Lord Lyndhurst has no rival in either House. In this respect he is a host in him-

self. He is wily and tricky in the extreme. His plans are always ingenious, and, in so far as depends on himself, they are executed with corresponding skill. In a few instances, however, he has overreached himself, and plunged his party deeper in the difficulties from which he intended to extricate them. The success of his motion, in 1832, for the transposition of Schedules A. and C. in the Reform Bill, is a case in point. He thereby ejected the Ministry of Earl Grey, but he underestimated the ardour and energy of Reform principles in the country at the time, which rendered it impossible to carry on a government for even one short week, on principles opposite to those on which the Grey Administration had been conducted. The attempt, therefore, to form a Tory government at that particular time was found to be futile; and, as a necessary result, Earl Grey and his colleagues were recalled to office. Another instance of the same thing occurred last Session, in the case of the Municipal Corporation Reform Bill. He thought that the clauses of that measure which he caused to be expunged, would insure the rejection of the Bill on the part of the Commons; while, by not throwing it out in the Lords, the odium of its rejection would attach entirely to the other House. The result, as is known to all, proved different from what he

had anticipated: the Commons accepted the Bill as returned to them by the Lords.

It is a fact, which is worthy of being mentioned, that after Lord Lyndhurst's miscalculation in 1832, as to the consequences of defeating Earl Grey on schedules A. and C. of the Reform Bill, he was hardly ever seen in his place in the House of Lords until the meeting of last Session, when his party were in power. I do not recollect seeing him once in the House in the Session of 1834, and not above two or three times in that of 1833. What the cause of this singular and protracted absence was, I do not know. I have heard it was some difference which occurred between him and some of the other leading members of his party at the time—during the Grey interregnum—they were attempting to construct a Tory Ministry. Whether there be any truth in the statement, I have no means of knowing.

Lord Lyndhurst cannot be said, in the usual sense of the term, to be an eloquent speaker. His manner is infinitely too cold and formal to give that effect to his matter, which, when spoken, would deserve the name of a high order of eloquence. When his speeches are read, however, many passages commend themselves to one's mind as instinct with eloquence of a superior class. His style is

clear, perspicuous, and simple in no ordinary degree. It has a good deal of the Addisonian in it : it is always correct ; it is polished, without being elaborately so. He speaks with marvellous ease : his sentences flow from him copiously and naturally : he scarcely ever has to recal a word, nor could the most fastidious ear detect one out of place, in the course of a long speech. His delivery is neither too slow nor too rapid : he never speaks long at a time, in comparison with the length at which some other noble Lords would address the House on the same subject. He is always listened to with the deepest attention by noble Lords of all shades of politics. The moment he rises, all is quiet ; and not a breath is to be heard till he has resumed his seat. Independently of his universally acknowledged talents as a debater, there is something in his very appearance and manner calculated to command attention and respect. He has a fine manly figure, and the moment he rises and commences his speech, there is, in addition to a very intelligent countenance, a manifest consciousness of his own intellectual superiority,—without any thing having the slightest resemblance to conceit,—which cannot fail of ensuring attention and respect from all present.

In height, he is rather above the usual size, and

as just stated, is of a handsome make. His countenance, like his manner of addressing the House, is open and winning: he always looks cheerful and good-natured. Those who did not know his character would infer from the expression of his face, that he was soft and modest to such an extent as to trench on energy and decision of mind. His forehead is high, and well developed, and his mouth is full of character; his eye is quick and piercing, and his nose has a good deal of the aquiline conformation. His complexion is dark, and his face inclines to the oval form. What the colour of his hair is, I do not know, as he wears a wig. He is apparently of a sound and healthy constitution, and looks much younger than he is. No one, to see him in the House of Lords, would suppose him to be in his sixty-fourth year. When he used to sit in a court of law, clothed in the habiliments of a Judge, he looked perhaps as old as he is.

Of late he has always occupied a part of the House remotest from the Woolsack and the Throne. He sits immediately close to the bar. Unlike most of the other Peers, he seldom carries on private conversation with any one: he is most carefully attentive to every thing that passes around him, though often sitting in an easy, thoughtless sort of position, as if he were paying no attention to any

thing saying or doing in the House. His favourite position, when listening to any thing to which he means to reply, is, to sit with his left leg over his right, while the latter is gently patting the floor. I have also repeatedly seen him, in his most attentive moments, amusing himself by striking his boot with his cane.

The first thing which attracts a stranger's attention when Lord ELLENBOROUGH rises to address the House, is the quantity of hair on his head, and the number of carefully-curled locks which he always sports. Some men are proud of their whiskers; others of their mustachios—Colonel Sibthorpe, in the other House, for example;—but of all the legislators in either House, Lord Ellenborough stands alone in the attention he pays to the hair of his head, and in the extent to which he glories in it. He is inordinately proud of his dark brown locks; he would not suffer them to be cropped for twice the amount of his hereditary pension of £10,000 a year. No lady rejoices more in her ringlets, nor is at more pains in adjusting them. He is a good-looking man, though his complexion is rather too florid. His countenance, which has something of the Grecian form about it, indicates great self-possession and coldness of manner, which are two of the leading attributes of his character.

He is tall, and well made: his constitution is evidently strong, and his health excellent. He looks rather young for a man who has entered his forty-sixth year.

As a speaker, Lord Ellenborough is one of the most correct in the House; but, then, it is that cold, inanimate correctness which never makes an impression. His enunciation is as perfect as can be conceived; it is timed with the greatest judgment to the ear. He stands nearly as motionless as a statue when addressing the House. His voice is clear and strong, and his language is always correct. His ideas, such as they are, are always clothed in correct and elegant diction; the only source of regret is, that he often decks out in the choicest apparel, ideas which possess so little originality or merit as to be hardly worthy a covering of rags. His mind is not much above mediocrity. He never shows anything like ingenuity or vigour in discussing a subject. His mind is unfitted for grappling with great questions; and he seems to have the good sense to be conscious of this, for he comparatively seldom speaks on subjects of the first magnitude. He evinces great patience and industry in making himself master of the details of less important questions; and on such questions, for this reason, he generally makes

a better speech than a man of greater talents would do. He has a singular taste for the driest and least interesting subjects imaginable. For years past he has, every Session, brought forward a motion for compensation to some Indian Prince, in consequence of certain losses which the latter is alleged to have suffered about twenty years ago, through the culpable negligence or positive misconduct of our government in the East. This motion is always prefaced by a long speech, occupying usually about two hours, which no one listens to except the unfortunate member of the Government whose office dooms him to the task of reply. Mr. Herries has also been in the habit, for some years past, of making a similar motion and speech in the other House. The motions and speeches, however, end in nothing in both cases, as the noble Lord and the right honourable Gentleman severally withdraw their motions.

Lord Ellenborough's conceptions of a subject, if only commonplace, are always clear. You never see any confusion in his ideas or in his manner of expressing them. In giving a summary or recapitulation of the proceedings of the House on any particular subject, the noble Lord perhaps excels any other member of either branch of the

Legislature. His review, last Session, when the Municipal Corporation Reform Bill was sent up a second time from the other House, of what their Lordships had done in reference to the measure, was one of the clearest and most correct statements I ever heard made. On that occasion he also evinced very considerable talent in the defence he urged on behalf of the Lords in regard to the alterations they had made in the Bill.

He is a decided Tory, but has shrewdness enough to perceive that "the better part of valour is discretion." He is always for adopting the mildest and most conciliatory course, consistently with an adherence to his own and his party's principles, in dealing with an opponent.

He is courteous and gentlemanly in his language towards those from whom he differs. No one ever heard him give utterance to an unbecoming word. This conduct on his part always ensures respectful treatment from his opponents, when replying to him.

No one on his side of the House evinced greater alarm lest the Commons should reject the Municipal Corporation Reform Bill as altered by the Lords, last Session, than he did. He clearly foresaw the fearful consequences which such a contingency would entail, both on the Legislature itself and on

the country. Hence he did every thing he could, in the House and privately, to prevent any collision between the two Houses, by endeavouring to prevail on the Commons to accept the Bill as altered by the Lords. He speaks pretty often, and is usually listened to with respectful attention.

The moment Lord FITZGERALD and VESSEY rises to address their Lordships, all eyes are turned towards him. He has a remarkably fine voice, which he pitches, the moment he commences, in a very high key. His voice has not only great power, but much flexibility ; he does not, however, always manage its intonations with the best effect. He speaks with great fluency. His words flow from him like a copious stream. He never hesitates for a moment, and very rarely gives utterance to a word which he has occasion to recal. The most fastidious taste could not find fault with the construction of his sentences. Of his ideas, I cannot say as much. They are very commonplace, though, owing to his remarkably showy qualities as a speaker, they appear tolerably good while listening to him. The best proof that there is little in his speeches, is to be found in the fact that, though you cannot fail to admire his dexterity and tact in rounding his periods, you never feel that anything he has said has made the slightest

impression on your mind. Often, indeed, does sentence after sentence roll on in stately majesty, without your being able to discover an idea at all. If there be ideas in the instances to which I refer, they are so concealed amidst a mass of verbiage, that you feel certain, in your own mind, the discovery, when made, would not at all reward the labour expended in the search. He is nearly as prodigal of his gesture as of his words. There is hardly a speaker in the House more redundant in his gesticulation. One could excuse a little occasional excess in this respect, when the subject is one of a nature calculated to excite warmth of feeling; but the noble Lord is always equally vehement in his action, be the question before the House what it may. He throws both hands up into the air, as high as they will go; and then thrusts them down with equal force, as if he were about to smash in pieces some resisting object. The movements of his body seem otherwise made to match with the loudness of his tone, the emphasis of his delivery, and the violent motions of his arms. He wheels about in every direction, and makes evolutions, and assumes positions peculiar to himself. He speaks extempore, but the arrangement of his matter is usually as good as if his speech were carefully prepared. He does not speak

often; he has too high an opinion of his oratory for that. He would deem it wasted altogether, if expended on topics of minor importance. He reserves himself for great occasions. This Session, he has not yet spoken at all; last Session, if I remember rightly, he only spoke once, and that was on the Irish Church Appropriation question.

He is a good-looking man. He is about the ordinary height, and rather stoutly made: his appearance is gentlemanly, without having any thing of the superciliousness of the aristocrat: his face is full, and his complexion very fair. It is impossible to see him without admiring the regularity of his features: his forehead is ample, both in breadth and height, and his light-brown hair is usually so adjusted as to allow it to be seen to the best advantage. He is in the meridian of life, being only in his forty-fourth year.

LORD ASHBURTON is as yet but imperfectly known by his title: it will be some time before the public eye and ear become so familiar with it as they were with the name of Alexander Baring. He is a man of very considerable talent, and possesses excellent business habits. These qualities, added to a heavy purse, made him a man of some importance in the House of Commons. In the

House of Lords he does not promise to acquire the same station. Had he been consistent as a public man, his influence in the Lower House would have been vastly greater than it ever was. But he was remarkable for his inconsistency in more ways than one. The changes his opinions underwent on the question of the Corn Laws, and on topics more strictly political, are known to every body. But the most awkward part of the matter was, that his principles always changed at the same time, and in the same direction, as his interests. Hence *The Times* used always to distinguish him from all the other members, by the appellation of "the representative of his breeches' pocket." In 1815 he was the idol of the populace of London, and of all large towns, because of his most strenuous and persevering opposition to the Corn Laws. Shortly afterwards he became the proprietor of a large landed estate, and from that moment to this he has been one of the most zealous supporters of those laws, in either House of Parliament. But the most singular species of inconsistency which has, on many occasions, characterised his conduct as a Member of Parliament, has been, that of speaking one way and voting in directly the opposite. He has acquired a sort of proverbial notoriety for this.

He excels all men I ever knew, with the single

exception of the late Lord Castlereagh, in mystifying a subject, when it serves his purpose to do so. He has often been heard to speak for an hour at a time when a member of the other House, and yet, when he sat down, leave the House as much in the dark as to his real views on the subject on which he had been speaking, as when he began his address. What, perhaps, was the most singular circumstance in his successful efforts at mystification, was, that you could never with truth charge him with digressing from the subject. He appeared all the while to be speaking strictly to the question, though no one could understand a single word he said. He can, however, be clear enough when he chooses; indeed, there are few who can be more so. I have often admired the lucidness of his arrangement, the appropriateness of his arguments, and the transparency of his style. He is cogent in his reasonings, and yet singularly plain and simple in his language, whenever it pleases him. He is a man of very considerable information: he is well read on most questions of legislation; but is especially conversant with the Corn Law and Currency questions. His mind is quick in its perceptions. He is acute in detecting the slips, or weak points, of an adversary: he is more; he is dexterous in appearing to have detected errors where they do not exist. If an

opponent has committed no mistakes, he will, with infinite *nonchalance*, ascribe some to him, and then proceed to grapple with and correct them. He is an unfair debater, both as respects his own sentiments, and as regards the arguments of his opponents. And yet while uttering or stringing together sentence after sentence, which mean nothing, and while correcting the blunders of an opponent which that opponent never committed, he has so much apparent sincerity and good-nature about him, that it is impossible you can entertain towards him any unkindly feeling.

He is not a fine speaker. His voice is somewhat feeble, but it is clear and pleasant. He is often incorrect in his language, and sometimes stammers while correcting himself. He is moderate in his use of gesture, which chiefly consists in turning his face, at short intervals, from one part of the House to the other, with a slight occasional waving of his right hand. When sitting, his head is erect enough, but when speaking you usually see it leaning a little to one side. He has only spoken two or three times in the House of Lords.

He is of the ordinary height, rather stoutly, though not robustly, made. His face partakes of rotundity. His forehead has more of breadth than height. His eyes are small, but quick and sparkling.

His features otherwise are regular and pleasing. There is nothing particularly indicative of intelligence in his countenance ; its chief characteristic is that of being on good terms with himself ; and in this respect his physiognomy does not deceive the observer. Other persons may think him as much wrong as they please ; but I should like to see the man who will convince himself that he is in error. At any rate, he will never acknowledge it. You may vanquish him as often and completely as you choose ; you will find him still maintaining that his positions are impregnable, and his consistency perfectly unimpeachable. He has considerably passed the meridian of life, being in his fifty-sixth year.

The name of LORD ABINGER, like that of Lord Ashburton, is one which has not yet made itself familiar to the public eye or ear—and, indeed, I question if it ever will ; for active as was the part which his Lordship took in public affairs, until the last few years, when Sir James Scarlett and a member of the other House—he seems now resolved to spend the remainder of his days in silence and repose. My own impression as to the chief cause of his late inactivity and silence is the same as that generally entertained by those who know him. He has never recovered from the severe stroke which his reputation received by his conduct as Attorney-General under the Duke of Wellington's government,

While filling that office he instituted more criminal prosecutions against the Press in the short space of three years, than had been instituted by all the previous Attorney-Generals for the preceding thirty years; and this, too, while he professed himself a Whig, and they were Tories. Out of office he was always the unqualified denouncer of State prosecutions of the Press, and times without number did he toast "The Liberty of the Press," as being as necessary as the air we breathe; in power he did his best to destroy both it and his own reputation. In the former case, he succeeded to a certain extent, and for a time—as the late unfortunate *Morning Journal* could bear witness;—in the latter, he has succeeded entirely. His worst enemies could not wish to see him with a more seriously-damaged reputation as a public man. Like all those who, under suspicious circumstances, change their principles—when they do so from conviction it is another and commendable matter—he forfeited the confidence of the party he had abandoned, while he never gained that of the party to whom he attached himself. During the few years he was in the House of Commons, after the breaking up of the Wellington Administration, he constituted a forcible illustration of the homely aphorism of falling between two chairs. He was equally disowned and suspected by both Whigs and Tories. Night after night did he

sit alone, having no other companionship than that of his own cogitations. In the midst of society he was in solitude. For a time he bore up with the best grace he could under the slights which were shown him. At length his stock of philosophy became exhausted, and he in a great measure absented himself from the House. Few and far between were the times in which he was found in his place. He is not in a much better predicament in the Upper House. Though to all intents and purposes a Tory in his conduct, whatever he may be in theory, he has not yet succeeded in getting into the good graces of that party. I doubt if he ever will worm himself into their confidence: I am satisfied he himself is afraid he will not. He is very irregular in his attendance in the House, and has not uttered fifty sentences in it since his elevation.

Lord Abinger is a man of very considerable talent, and for many years was looked on as a person of great importance in the ranks of the Whigs. He has not the remotest pretensions to genius, and never gave expression to a single profound or brilliant thought; but he always evinced much of that talent in speaking which, where average powers of mind previously exist, may, by careful and indefatigable study, be acquired. His talents, in other words, are acquired rather than natural; or, as Sir

Walter Scott once said, in a private letter to the author, in reference to another person, his wit is that of the schoolmaster rather than of his mother. Lord Abinger, when speaking in the House of Commons, was always above common-place; or, if his arguments were not in themselves deserving of a high character, he invariably put them in so clear a light, and used them with so much of the dexterity which he had acquired in the practice of his profession, that they had the appearance of something more than the average merit. His speeches frequently partook of the quality called special pleading. When it suited his purpose, no one could be more clear: when it served his object to mystify, there were few in the House who could do so with better effect. In both cases he appeared equally sincere. His manner was highly seductive: he always spoke in a fascinating tone, and looked you so smilingly and alluringly in the face, that, unless you were particularly on your guard against his blandishments, you ran a great risk of being insensibly taken captive by him. He was always cool and collected, and never lost sight for a moment of the main point he had to establish, or the object he had to gain. It was these qualities, conjoined with sound and varied legal knowledge, that gained him so high a reputa-

tion at the bar. He evinced consummate tact in addressing a jury. The moment he entered the court, he made it his business to single out in his own mind three or four of the most intelligent of the jury in addition to the foreman. He knew that if he could only, by any means, gain these over to the side of his client, the victory was to a certainty won, as the others would be sure, if they did not originally entertain the same views, to be brought over to them when they all retired for consultation. He then, when he rose to address the "gentlemen of the jury,"—on whom he always lavished a world of encomiums for respectability, intelligence, a desire to discharge their duty conscientiously, and so forth,—fixed his eye on one of those he had singled out in his own mind, on whom he kept it intently fixed with a most captivating gaze until he saw, from the assenting nod, or the concurring expression of the countenance, that all was safe in so far as that juror was concerned. Withdrawing his seductive and penetrating eye from him, he fixed it on the others in succession, until he either saw he had achieved a similar triumph with them, or that his sophistry had been detected. Each thought himself peculiarly honoured by the attention which the learned counsel thus paid to him. By these means he gained, perhaps, a greater number of

cases, in proportion to the number in which he was retained, than any other member of the bar during the present century. Mr. Brougham's immeasurably greater talents did not command nearly so many triumphs as Sir James Scarlett's consummate tact.

Lord Abinger has no pretensions to the character of an orator, for which his manner is much too cold and quiet. His voice is clear and penetrating, but it wants flexibility and depth of tone. It has no variety. It is monotonous throughout. He deals little in gesticulation. His arms generally hang down by his sides, or are placed in some other attitude of repose. Sometimes, but seldom, I have seen him stretch out his right hand, and make a few slow gentle movements with it. His body, otherwise, is as motionless as if it were transfixed to the spot, except when moving his face at certain intervals from one part of the House to the other.

In his personal appearance he realizes, in some measure, our ideas of Falstaff. If anything, he is above the general height. In circumference there are not many men in proportion to his size otherwise, who surpass him. His belly projects to an unusual extent, even for a corpulent man. His face is large and full. He is double-chinned. His eyes are small, but quick and piercing. His com-

plexion is fair, mingled with a good deal of ruddiness, while his hair is of a white colour. His eyes and mouth are full of character. The expression of his countenance is pleasant in no ordinary degree: a perpetual smile, blended with an air of joviality, plays upon it. You would fancy him, judging merely by his looks, to be one of the happiest men alive; and he may be so, in point of fact, for anything I know to the contrary. He is now far advanced in life, being in his fifty-eighth year.

LORD WHARNCLIFFE is a nobleman who is regarded with much respect by both sides of the House. There are but few more intelligent Members in it. He is more or less acquainted with every subject that comes under the consideration of the Legislature; with some subjects he is, perhaps, more conversant than any Peer of the realm. One topic, which has occupied much of his thoughts, is that of our criminal jurisprudence. Those who differ from his theories on this topic, must do justice to the extent of his information on it. He possesses considerable talents. He is not only quick in detecting the weak points of an opponent, but skilful, in no ordinary degree, in throwing a veil of speciousness over his own views when submitting them to the House. Right or wrong, he hardly ever fails to make out a plausible case.

His speech, in the third week of the present Session, on the appointment of Lord Lieutenants of counties by the present Ministry, was admitted on all hands to be able and ingenious. It occupied nearly two hours in the delivery. He is not a showy speaker. His voice, though clear, is not strong. Sometimes he is inaudible, owing to a habit he has got of lowering his voice, not only at the conclusion of long sentences, but sometimes during the delivery of several entire consecutive sentences together. His language is not fine; it is, however, usually correct. There is no appearance of labour about it. He evidently adopts the suggestion of Sir Egerton Brydges, and employs the phraseology which first occurs to his mind. He never attempts the higher strains of oratory. He indulges in no tropes or figures, nor does he ever resort to declamation. Indeed, he seems to rely exclusively, either on the intrinsic excellence of his cause, or on his own powers of putting it plausibly, or on both. I do not suppose he has any wish to shine as an orator. It is certain, though he were to live for centuries to come, he would never attain distinction as a mere speaker. To the comparative feebleness of his voice, he superadds the want of the power of modulating it to any extent. And, last of all, he wants fluency. He often stammers,

and corrects and re-corrects inaccurate expressions. His speeches may, and generally do, enlighten the minds of his audience, but they never produce any effect, or leave any impression. He is by no means a pleasant speaker, and nothing but the respect entertained for his private character and talents ensures the attention of the House. His manner is awkward. He makes a liberal use of his right arm at occasional intervals, and he has of late acquired a singular habit of turning his whole body from one part of the House to another. If his face be this moment towards the Woolsack, you see it the next towards the Bar. If he looks one time at Ministers—who are always opposite the place from which he addresses their Lordships—you see him, in an instant afterwards, with his back to them, and looking as earnestly in the faces of some of his own friends, as if he were inquiring of them, with the greatest solicitude, the state of their health. At one moment you see him standing quite erect, and holding up his head as if in the conscious justice of his cause ; the next, his head is drooping on his breast, and his eyes are fixed on the floor of the House, if not on his own feet. By removing one of the benches, a considerable addition has been lately made to the space between the Opposition benches and the table. I know of no

Peer to whom this has proved so great an improvement as to Lord Wharncliffe. He duly avails himself of the extended room, by always moving backwards and forwards when addressing their Lordships. Sometimes, indeed, he makes such use of it as actually to describe a circle of two or three yards in circumference.

The noble Lord has a wonderful command of his temper. Not only is there nothing impassioned in his usual manner of addressing the House, but even when he chances to become involved in a personal altercation, he evinces the greatest coolness and self-composure,—however excited his opponent may be. His opinions are not of the extreme Tory class, but they are certainly becoming gradually more so.

Lord Wharncliffe has passed the meridian of life, being in his sixtieth year. He has all the appearance of possessing a healthy constitution. He is slightly above the average height, and well proportioned. He is somewhat negligent in his dress. He has an open, pleasing countenance, highly indicative of intelligence and of moral energy blended with urbanity. His face is angular, and his features are regular. His complexion is fair, and his hair of a sandy colour. He has an eagle eye, and a finely developed forehead.

LORD KENYON is not a man of vigorous or comprehensive mind. His intellectual acquirements are below mediocrity. He has never done anything in the House which would have brought his name with any prominence before the public; but his connection with Orange Societies has done that for him in a more effectual manner that can be altogether agreeable to himself. For many years past he was known to be one of the most zealous supporters of Orangism, but the late proceedings in the House of Commons have unfolded tales on that subject for which the community were not prepared. No man, I believe, with the exception of the very few persons equally imbued with Orangism as himself, can justify the part he has lately acted as Deputy Grand Master of Orange Societies; but neither can any candid person deny him the merit—which is more than can be conceded to all the other “Brethren”—of being perfectly sincere in his opinions and honest in his conduct. His errors are clearly the errors which result from ignorance. His faith in the happy tendency of his principles is so great, and his attachment to them is so decided, that he would not hesitate a moment, should the necessity arise, in submitting to martyrdom for them. I recollect being near him when he presided last year, in Exeter Hall, at the great Protestant meeting, to

discuss the tenets of the Roman Catholics as embodied in the polemical works of the celebrated Peter Dens. On that occasion some indescribable scenes of uproar occurred in consequence of Lord Kenyon, who acted as chairman, having refused to hear any of the Roman Catholics. Some of the latter eventually became so indignant, that they threatened vengeance on his Lordship. A gentleman, who had overheard two of them saying Lord Kenyon should be a "marked man," whispered to his Lordship the circumstance, expressing with a very serious countenance a hope that he would take care of himself; "Pooh! Pooh!" exclaimed his Lordship, and then turned about his face to the person addressing the meeting, with as much coolness as if no such menace had been uttered.

His Lordship speaks but seldom in the House, and never at any great length; but he takes part with some frequency in the altercations which occasionally occur between other Peers. He is an indifferent speaker: his voice is clear enough, and he is sufficiently audible, but he wants energy and animation in his manner. His matter never arises above common-place; it is often below it. His style is generally bad; it is often at variance with the most ordinary rules of composition: it is never chaste or eloquent.

His Lordship is considerably advanced in life, being in his fifty-seventh year. He does not look quite so old. His complexion is florid, and his countenance has the impress of health on it. His nose is large, and of an aquiline form. His features are regular, and their general expression is pleasing, but by no means intellectual. His face is of the angular form. His hair is of a greyish colour, and is always remarkable for its shortness. He is about the middle size, and well proportioned. He is not particular about his toilet; but has a great partiality to a blue coat and light-coloured trousers.

CHAPTER X.

PEERS WHO HAVE SEATS IN THE CABINET.

LORD MELBOURNE — THE MARQUIS OF LANS-
 DOWNE—LORD HOLLAND—LORD DUNCANNON.

THE office of Prime Minister, which Lord Melbourne has, with a short interval, filled since Earl Grey's retirement from it, has, as a matter of course, attracted all eyes towards him, and made him the subject of the deepest interest. I question if any man has attained to the same elevation, in the course of the last century and a half, of whom so little was previously heard. As Lord Melbourne, he was not extensively known before his accession to his present office: as the Hon. William Lamb, he was still less so. Under the latter name he was known only as a Tory, or, at best, but as a moderate Reformer. His answer to those who contrast his present liberal sentiments with the moderate principles he professed some years back, is, that he has gained wisdom by experience, and that not he

only, but the nation, have made rapid progress, during the last eight or ten years, towards a more liberal order of things. He says, in short, in answer to those who reproach him with a dereliction of his early principles, that he is marching with the spirit of the age, and that he is acting up to the exigencies of the times. He is known to be one of the most liberal members of the Administration of which he is the head. It is well known how strenuously he stood up in his place in the House of Lords, for those clauses of the Municipal Corporation Bill which were eventually rejected by that body. It is an equally established fact, if I am not misinformed, though the public are not aware of it, that he strenuously contended, in the Cabinet Meetings held on the subject, that no concession, however trifling, ought to be made on that question to the Opposition Peers. His view of the matter was, that it would be vain to hope for conciliation on their part, however great the amount of concession made to them; that, in fact, the greater the concessions made, the more strenuous and determined in their opposition to the measure would they become. A majority of his colleagues, however, pointed out to him the frightful consequences which would, in all human probability, flow from a collision between the two Houses; and

pressed on him the wisdom of meeting the wishes of the Lords, as far it could be done without compromising their own characters for consistency, or impairing, to any great extent, the efficiency of the measure. He sacrificed his own individual opinions to the views entertained by a majority of his colleagues, and acquiesced in those modifications of the measure which secured to it the passive concurrence of the Tory Peers.

Lord Melbourne cannot be said to be a man of superior talents. He does not take comprehensive views of a great question, nor does he evince any thing like vigour or acuteness in attempting to grapple with it. The predominant quality of his mind is the common-sense view which he takes of a subject, and the clearness with which he communicates his ideas to others. If you look in vain for any original or striking arguments in his speeches, you cannot fail to observe that he has looked at the subject with the eye of a person of strong good sense; nor can you see him resume his seat, at the conclusion of his speech, without saying to yourself, that he has been remarkably clear and happy in the expression of his sentiments. His forte manifestly consists in singling out the strongest and most obvious arguments which can be advanced in favour of the view which he takes

of the question, and bringing them before your mind with all the vividness of perception with which they appear to his own. Like Earl Grey, he trusts much to what he conceives the justice and expediency of his measures; and he is so convinced that they are both just and expedient, that he would not, if he could, make any ingenious or sophistical speech in their support. He states to you the leading grounds on which he brings his measures forward; he endeavours to force the conviction home on your minds, which presses with an immovable weight on his own, that they are imperiously demanded by the exigencies of the case; and he also admonishes you, in the plainest terms the English language can supply, of what he fully believes will be the consequences of their rejection; and then leaves you to act as you think proper.

I never heard him attempt anything which could be called refined or ingenious argument. His speeches are so plain in their general tenour, that the dullest of comprehension may follow him with the greatest ease in every thing he says. Whatever he may be in his study, he is no philosopher in the House of Lords. He deals not in general principles: what he says in a given speech, is so strictly applicable to the point immediately before

the House, as if there were no other principle or topic in the universe, or he had never bestowed a thought on any other question. By hearing him speak, however, on different subjects, and at different times, you see clearly that he is a man of considerable reading, and that what he has read he has fully understood. I have, on several occasions, heard him quote, with singular felicity, short passages, both from the ancients, and from modern writers, in the various departments of literature, science, and philosophy. When he does so, he makes no parade of scholarship; you see at once it is not for the purpose of getting credit for learning, or for the purpose of effect, as the word is usually understood, that he quotes the sayings or arguments of others: it is obviously because those sayings or arguments bear directly on the question at issue. He quotes a passage from the Greeks or Romans, or from a modern author of celebrity, in the same way as common proverbs are made use of in conversation by the humbler classes of society.

His manner of speaking is so plain, that I never heard any one complain of misunderstanding what he said; and he is so ingenious and straightforward in dealing with an opponent, that I never, so far as I can remember, heard any one charge

him with misrepresentation. To his integrity of purpose all his opponents are forward to bear their testimony. They think him misguided; they look on him as acting a most dangerous as well as foolish part; but they never even hint a suspicion that he has any sinister purposes in view. They hesitate not to admit that he himself conceives he is pursuing that line of policy which will at once be most conducive to the stability of the Crown and the welfare of the people, though he is pursuing a course which, in their judgment, cannot fail to be productive of directly opposite results.

Lord Melbourne speaks but seldom; he never volunteers a speech. It is plain he does not fancy himself an orator, though many others do who cannot acquit themselves so creditably. He has obviously no pleasure in hearing himself speak. His voice is not very pleasant to the ears of others, neither is it to his own. It is only when the nature of the question before the House, and the duties of the distinguished office he fills, impose on him the necessity of speaking, that he rises to express his sentiments: and even then he is always as brief as possible: you see a visible endeavour to give the greatest amount of matter in the smallest space of time. There is no effort to express himself in

rounded periods, no attempt at fine speaking: he aims at nothing more than to make you understand what he himself thinks or feels on the subject. In this he is, as has been already mentioned, remarkably successful. Nothing can be more obvious than the view he entertains of the subject. He is profuse of thoughts, sparing of words. He scatters abroad his opinions and arguments with a prodigal hand; sometimes, as Mr. Sheil once observed of Mr. O'Connell's ideas, with scarcely a rag to cover them. He leaps to the great point at issue the moment he rises, and he does not quit it until he resumes his seat. You see his mind fixed on the real merits of the question to the exclusion of every thing else: the collateral parts of a subject hardly ever engage his attention. It is with the marrow of the matter that his own mind has been occupied, and to that he directs the attention of the minds of their Lordships. His speeches are consequently remarkable for their brevity. I know of no noble Lord in the habit of speaking in the House, who, in general, speaks for so short a time.

One of the most striking qualities in Lord Melbourne's mind is its great moral courage. He knows that the Opposition Peers feel towards his government and measures the most decided hos-

tility; he knows that, when addressing them in support of any particular course of policy he is pursuing, or intends to pursue, he is addressing a most unwilling audience; yet he sets courageously to work, and proclaims in their hearing his unpalatable views and intentions. The odds against him do not dishearten him; they inspire him with renewed courage. Strong in what he conceives the propriety and justice of his cause, he rushes boldly into the heart of the conflict, not doubting for a moment that, though the struggle may be severe, he and his government will eventually triumph. He is one of the few men who rise with the occasion. The greater the opposition he has to encounter, the more resolute and determined does he become. When in the midst of the battle, he usually grows warm; you see his feelings are at work; you see his bosom heaving with emotion. The excess of his feelings on such occasions usually impedes his utterance. He stutters a good deal; sometimes so much that you would almost think he would choke. In his more energetic moments he adopts the advice of Hamlet to the players, and suits the action to the word. Fixing his piercing, fiery eye on the Opposition, he often, in such cases, gives such a tremendous blow with his clenched fist on the clerk's table, as causes the House to ring

again, while one can fancy he hears each of the Peers on the opposite side saying to himself, "It is fortunate that was not my head."

Lord Melbourne, in dealing with an opponent, invariably avoids personalities. Sarcasm, in the usual acceptation of the term, is a weapon he never wields. His language is always courteous and inoffensive to noble Lords individually; it is not always equally guarded and moderate in speaking of them as a body. On several occasions, during his short career as first Minister of the Crown, he appealed to their fears, and endeavoured to menace them into an assent to his measures. At two distinct stages of the Municipal Reform Bill of last year did he have recourse to the expedient of a threat. This, however, was only in the warmth of the moment. It is also right to add, that he himself seemed fully convinced that those consequences of which he forewarned their Lordships would inevitably ensue from the mutilation, to the extent the Tory Peers contemplated, of that measure.

His action generally is plain and unpretending; in that, any more than in his language or delivery, he does not aim at oratorical effect. On ordinary occasions he uses his right arm moderately, while he holds his hat and walking stick—the latter he

always takes with him to the House—in his left hand. When the question is one of importance, or he expects to address their Lordships at some length, he lays his hat and walking-stick on the bench on which he was sitting, as soon as he rises. If he rise with his hat and cane in his left hand, as just stated, under the impression he will be brief and cool in the observations he is about to make, but finds himself wax warm, and get more lengthened in his remarks as he proceeds, he pauses for a moment till he has disburthened his left hand of the cane and hat, and then becomes violent in his gesture. You then see his face colour; you hear him, as before observed, repeatedly, and to an extent sometimes painful to all present, stutter; you hear at intervals his lusty knocks on the table; and you observe an excitement in his whole appearance which often causes him to draw hastily backward as far as the bench from which he has arisen will allow, and then rush forward again with equal precipitation, till prevented from advancing further by the table of the House.

Lord Melbourne's voice is not good; it wants flexibility; he has little or no controul over it, neither is it pleasant; it has something hard and husky about it. He speaks with some rapidity, always the more rapidly as he becomes excited.

He usually speaks in a sufficiently audible, though not in a loud tone.

Lord Melbourne, though not old, has passed the prime of life. He is in his fifty-seventh year. He is apparently in excellent health and full of spirits. The anxieties and responsibilities of office have not, as yet, made any visible impression on his countenance, which is much more open and cheerful than the countenances of statesmen usually are. His hair is of a dark grey colour, and his complexion is ruddy. His face is round, and his features are rather large and marked. His general appearance inclines to plainness, and in his manners there is a simplicity approaching to bluntness. No one who sees him would think that he had ever breathed the atmosphere of a Court. He has the aspect of a man of decision and firmness, which his conduct proves him to be. In height, he is about the usual size, with a strong compact frame inclining to stoutness, which is evidently capable of enduring great fatigue. He usually sits in an easy, careless posture, with one leg thrown over the other, and with his hat, which in the summer season is always a white one, sitting so loosely on the back of his head, that you think every moment it will fall off.

Lord HOLLAND is a name which used very frequently to meet the public eye: it now does so

comparatively seldom. From the commencement of the French Revolution, until ten or twelve years ago, Lord Holland was always found fighting in the first ranks of Liberalism. In the House of Lords he often stood almost alone. With the single exception of Earl Radnor, he was perhaps the most extensive reformer belonging to that branch of the Legislature. The nephew of Charles James Fox, and tutored by that distinguished man in the formation of his political opinions, Lord Holland, while possessing a portion of Fox's talents, adopted all his leading principles, and fully shared in his zeal for the promotion of the Liberal cause. Those who attentively observed his career must have been struck with his amazing devotion to his principles. He was ready to make any sacrifices for them ; and, considering the direction in which popular opinion ran, from the time his Lordship entered public life, till a few years after the peace of 1815, he may be said, by the bold and intrepid course he pursued, to have been a living martyr to his principles. His name, since the retirement of Fox from public life, was a sort of watchword among Reformers, and his house was a kind of rendezvous to the Reform Members of both Houses of Parliament. There were all the arrangements made and the plans laid, for carrying on with effect the war with

the Tories. Nor is Lord Holland's zeal in the Liberal cause even now abated one iota more than is the inevitable effect of advancing years and great bodily infirmity. It often, indeed, breaks through all physical and accidental obstructions, and manifests itself in a most striking manner. He regards Lord Melbourne as a Reformer of the right stamp, and has evinced an intensity of interest in the stability of his Administration, which he did not latterly in that of Earl Grey. After the passing of the Reform Bill, the two great measures in which he has manifested the most lively interest, are, a Reform in the Municipal Corporations, and a Reform in the Church. The first he has lived to see carried into effect to a very great extent; the second he expresses an ardent hope he will witness before he dies. His zeal for the success of the Municipal Reform Bill of last Session was so ardent, that he not only cheered Lord Melbourne and some of the other speakers in favour of the measure, until one would have thought his lungs would have served him no longer; but though obliged from bodily weakness to be wheeled into the House and out of it, and though unable to stand without the assistance of a crutch made for the purpose, he actually rose and spoke with great energy and talent, for nearly half an hour, in

favour of the measure. Some time before the Municipal Corporation Reform Bill was brought into the Upper House, Lord Melbourne, on a motion, if I remember rightly, of Earl Radnor, made a most liberal speech in favour of admitting Dissenters into the Universities. Lord Holland, as if anticipating what he was about to say, seated himself, immediately on his rising, on one of the wool-sacks, so as to command a full view of the Prime Minister's face. The latter had hardly got to the fourth or fifth sentence when Lord Holland, delighted with the decidedly liberal tone in which he began his speech, expressed that delight by a most lusty and hearty cheer. Lord Melbourne grew more warm, and, if possible, more liberal as he proceeded, and Lord Holland's admiration and delight increasing proportionately, the latter nobleman may be said to have literally cheered Lord Melbourne, at the full stretch of his voice, during the delivery of a speech which lasted about twenty minutes, and without any other intermission than that requisite to draw his breath; in other words, the sound of one cheer had scarcely died away, when it was followed by another still more hearty, if possible, than its predecessor. Lord Melbourne must have felt that there was a great deal too much of a good thing, for his voice was repeatedly

drowned by the stentorian applause of his ardent admirer. As cheers, especially such lusty ones, are not very common in the Upper House, and as, on this occasion, Lord Holland had a monopoly of the exercise of his lungs, no other Peer uttering even a faint whisper—the circumstance had a ludicrous effect on the House; and the ludicrousness of the thing was greatly heightened by the noble Lord staring the speaker full in the face, throwing back his head in a laughing mood, and giving other proofs of the supreme exultation he felt at the tone of Lord Melbourne's speech, as he concluded every successive sentence.

It will be inferred, from what has been already stated, that the circumstance of Lord Holland's name being now scarcely ever seen in the reports of the parliamentary debates, is owing to his advanced years and his bodily infirmities. The same causes have, in some measure, impaired the vigour of his intellect and the effectiveness of his speeches, but he still acquits himself, when addressing the House, in a manner which many noble Lords in the prime of life cannot fail to envy, and which shows what his mental and oratorical qualifications must have been when in the full bloom of life. He was then remarkable for clearness and comprehensiveness of mind, and for a forcible and eloquent

exposition of his views. He excelled in exposing those sophistries of an opponent which would have escaped the perception of others. He saw with a sort of intuition the weak points in an antagonist's speech; and from the felicity and conclusiveness, conjoined with the ease and fluency, of his replies, you would have thought he must, by a species of prescience, have anticipated everything of any weight which would emanate from the opposite side, and prepared his own speech accordingly. There is a great deal of this in his speeches still. The speech to which I have already referred, as having been made in favour of the Municipal Corporation Bill last Session, was in reply to a very ingenious speech of Lord Lyndhurst, in opposition to that measure, and the acuteness, ability, and eloquence it evinced in a man so advanced in years, and labouring under such heavy bodily infirmity, were the admiration of all present.

One prominent feature in the character of Lord Holland was—I speak in the past tense, because we can now expect to hear but few more speeches from him—the fearlessness with which he stood up in the House, as he did out of it, for his principles. He was at all times the strenuous uncompromising defender of those principles, whenever and by whomsoever attacked, though he knew that they

were not only disliked, but absolutely detested by at least nine-tenths of the Peers, and when they were only coldly approved of and supported in a more modified form, by almost all the remainder.

I have mentioned that Lord Holland entered public life contemporaneously with the breaking out of the French Revolution. He took his seat in the Lords in 1794, but did not address the House for two years thereafter. His first speech gave ample earnest of the eminence to which his talents, and his zeal in the cause of universal liberty, could not fail to raise him. It was in opposition to the second reading of the Assessed Tax Bill, which was then brought in by Ministers for the avowed purpose of enabling Government to carry on the war against France. He maintained in a second speech of great eloquence and ingenuity, that, by the course which Ministers had pursued for some years previously, they had virtually sacrificed the British Constitution; and in reference to the defence which Lord Grenville, then Secretary of State, made of the conduct of Government in bringing forward the Assessed Tax Bill, he quoted with infinite effect the well-known lines of a popular poet. "The argument of the noble Secretary," observed his Lordship, "reminds me of some humorous lines by one of our best poets:—

‘ Thus Harlequin extolled his horse,
Fit for the road, the race, the course ;
One fault he had—a fault indeed !
And what was that?—the horse was dead !

“ So of the genuine Constitution of England,” continued his Lordship. “ It had every excellent quality that could endear it to a rational or a free people ; but, alas, it was no longer in existence.”

I have thus particularly adverted to the parliamentary *debut* of the noble Lord, because it is by no means improbable, advanced in years and infirm in body as he is, that his speech of last Session, to which I have also particularly alluded, may be among the last, if not the last, which we shall ever hear from his lips. What a long series of most important transactions in which he performed no inconsiderable part, have taken place in the theatre of the political world, in the long interval between the delivery of the two speeches to which I have referred !

Lord Holland’s style united elegance with vigour in a degree of which there are but few examples. His voice was clear, commanding, and in some of its intonations musical. He generally pitched it on a loud key ; in some of his more animated moments it was unpleasantly loud. He usually spoke with much ease, and always in such a way as proved

him to be perfectly master of his subject. In his action there was much energy; sometimes extravagance. Indeed it could hardly have been otherwise, feeling as he did so strongly on all great political questions. His warmth of feeling on such occasions often impeded his utterance. He was invariably listened to with the utmost attention; nor could it have been otherwise from his great talents and eloquence, blended as these were with a striking boldness and energy of manner, and a voice of unusual power. This would be still the case could he speak oftener; for the speech of last Session to which I have more than once alluded as the last he has made, and the only one, I believe, for two years past, was listened to with as much attention as was ever accorded to any member of the House.

Lord Holland is a man of considerable literary attainments. He has read extensively, and digested well what he has read. When the *Edinburgh Review* was in the zenith of its fame, he, as well as Lady Holland, was a frequent contributor to its pages. While his Lordship's articles were chiefly on questions having either directly or indirectly a political bearing, those of his Lady must, I presume, have been principally, if not exclusively, of a literary character. In early life Lord Holland was fond of poetical studies, especially of the study of the Spanish poets, and

he is well known in the literary world for his translations, published in 1803 or 1804, of the most popular dramas of Lopez de Vega, and of some minor poems of much interest, though far less popular.

His Lordship is in his sixty-third year. His hair is white, and the crown of his head partially bald. His forehead is well developed, but there is nothing particularly intellectual in the combined expression of his features. His eyes are small, clear, and of a laughing character. A physiognomist would at once, from the general expression of his countenance, set him down as one who is unusually cheerful, and as having a great flow of animal spirits—an impression which would be fully confirmed before he had been fifteen minutes in his company. His complexion is clear, mingled with a portion of ruddiness, and his features are small and regular. His face has a degree of rotundity about it. He cannot be called corpulent, and yet there is a stoutness about his person that approaches to corpulency. In stature he is somewhat above the average size.

The next member of the Cabinet having a seat in the Upper House, whose name most frequently appears before the public, is the Marquis of LANSDOWNE. Perhaps there is no individual in either House at present, whose *debut* in public

life inspired such high and general expectations of a brilliant future career, as did the first appearance in public of the noble Marquis. He had, when only a school-boy, just entered on his teens, displayed a precocity of intellect, by which he was enabled to reason his father out of certain prejudices which he entertained against public schools, and to obtain his consent to his being sent to Westminster. After remaining some time there, he was sent to Edinburgh, where he not only enjoyed the best instruction which the institutions and learned men of the Modern Athens could furnish him with, but resided in the house of Dugald Stewart, one of the greatest men which Scotland has produced. Never, therefore, did a young man prosecute his literary studies under more favourable circumstances. And, that he might prepare himself as far as practicable for that habit of extemporaneous speaking which is at once so ornamental and useful in a Legislator—which he had an almost certain prospect of becoming on his reaching his majority—he became a member of an institution called “The Speculative Society,” established for the express purpose of improving young noblemen and gentlemen in the art of debating. Here the noble Marquis, then Lord Henry Petty, came in contact with some of the leading spirits of the age.

Collision in debate with such men could not fail to prove highly advantageous to one so well educated, and possessing such natural talents as the young nobleman. He quitted Edinburgh, and ceased to be a member of the Speculative Society, with the reputation of being one of the most promising young men, especially as a debater, of the day. He afterwards overcame his father's reluctance to his entering Cambridge University, his parent having a decided preference for Oxford. His partialities being in favour of Trinity College, it was of that college of the University of which he became a member. In Cambridge, he had every mark of respect and attention shown him by the most learned and influential persons in the place. The professors hailed his entrance to the University as a connection which was destined to extend and perpetuate its fame. In Lord Petty they saw, or fancied they saw, one who would successfully dispute the palm of public applause with Lord (then Mr.) Brougham, who was at that time beginning to raise himself into distinction by his great literary acquirements and talents as a public speaker. His private friends were still more sanguine. They were confident he would, the moment he started in his public course, distance Lord Brougham,

and leave him for ever after following him far behind.

The intellectual resources and debating capabilities of the young nobleman were destined to be soon subjected to the ordeal of a public trial. At so early a period as his twenty-second year, he was returned to the House of Commons as the representative of Calne. This was during the memorable though short period in which the peace of Amiens nominally remained unbroken. No sooner had Lord Henry Petty entered St. Stephen's, than he afforded the public an opportunity of judging how far he merited the very high eulogiums which his friends pronounced upon him. He immediately delivered his maiden speech, which was one of considerable length, and which was duly followed up by a succession of others; but it is a somewhat singular fact, that notwithstanding the admirable topics which the spirit-stirring European politics of that period, soon after, by the revival of the war with France, so amply furnished to any young Member ambitious of senatorial distinction, Lord Petty, for two or three years, carefully avoided all reference to those topics, and almost exclusively restricted his eloquence to Irish affairs.

It is not to be denied that the young nobleman,

on his first entrance on public life, acquitted himself in a highly creditable manner; but it was soon evident that the partiality of private friends, and the mistaken judgment of others who had formed their estimate of him, on the principle that "all is gold that glitters," had vastly overrated his intellectual powers. The more discerning and less interested observer saw at once that he was more showy than solid; that a mere command of words, with a very respectable share of information, and talents above mediocrity, had either been mistaken for, or magnified into, intellectual powers of the highest order, and a readiness and effectiveness in debate, which would enable the young nobleman to eclipse every other public man of his day. This estimate of Lord Petty's talents and his qualifications as a public speaker, soon after his first introduction into Parliament, is, perhaps, as just with regard to the Lord Lansdowne of the present day as any estimate could be. His fluency is very great: I know of no man who has a greater command of words. He is never at a loss; and the most fastidious taste, in so far as mere elegance is concerned, could not in any case suggest better phrasology than he employs. But in his anxiety to render his periods as rounded as possible, and to acquire for himself the reputation of possessing an elegant

style, he often becomes feeble; especially in those cases where his matter is not of a superior description. Sometimes, indeed, he is all words together: you cannot but admire the elegance with which his sentences are constructed, and the fluency with which they are delivered; but you cannot, after all the efforts you may have made with that view, discover an idea. Let me not be understood to imply that this is generally or even frequently the case; but it does occasionally occur, and, perhaps, has occurred oftener since he became a member of the Government, than it did when he was in opposition.

Lord Lansdowne has no pretensions to vigour or originality of mind. You never can discover anything which argues the profound thinker in any of his speeches. I have heard his leading speeches delivered for some years past; but I never heard anything, even by accident, escape his lips, which could be called a bold or ingenious conception. Neither, however, will you, on the other hand, ever find him dealing in things which are silly or absurd. Whatever he says, though often, as before observed, buried under a load of verbiage, is always pertinent to the question under discussion, and it has generally the merit of being one of the best things which the mind of a man of

strong good sense would suggest on the subject. There is a wonderful equability as regards the talent which his speeches display. You will not find him happy on one occasion, and unhappy on another : if you hear him a hundred times, you will quit the House, except in so far as a difference in the interest and importance of the subject necessarily makes a difference in his speeches,—with the same estimate of his abilities as you formed when you first heard him.

Lord Lansdowne is one of the few men in either House who excel in the defence of a measure ; almost all of them, of any note, are greatest in attack. It is, however, to be observed of the noble Marquis, that his happiness in the vindication of the measures he supports, is only visible when replying to some opponent who has attacked those measures. He makes comparatively but an indifferent appearance in introducing a measure ; but in replying to some Peer on the opposite side who has assailed it, he often evinces great acuteness in detecting the weak points of his opponent, and in turning the very grounds on which that opponent attacks the measure, into weapons wherewith to attack his own principles or conduct as a public man.

The noble Marquis's political principles are not remarkable for their liberality: they are far less liberal than those of the head of the Administration. He never belonged to the school of the ultra Whigs, and he certainly has not increased in the liberality of his principles of late. He would be much more comfortable in a Cabinet of a more moderately Whiggish complexion than in that of Lord Melbourne. It was matter of surprise to many that he did not secede from the Administration of Earl Grey, with Lords Stanley and Ripon, and the other two Members of that government. At all events, it is well known to his friends, and must, from the subdued tone his opposition latterly assumed to the Government of Liverpool, have been visible to all who attentively watch the conduct of public men,—that had not that nobleman's government been dissolved by his premature political death, Lord Lansdowne would have joined it.

He has great presence of mind; he is generally cool and collected, and speaks with wonderful ease and fluency on any subject, without the slightest premeditation. His language is always temperate, even when you visibly see he is labouring under some degree of warmth. He studiously shuns personalities; indeed, compared with the other House of Parliament, very few personalities are indulged

in by any Member,—always, of course, excepting Lord Brougham.

The noble Marquis is ambitious. Even so far back as 1806, when Mr. Pitt died, it is well understood he then, though only in his 30th year, aspired at the office of Prime Minister. His ambition was to a certain extent gratified by his being made a member, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, of the “All the Talents” Ministry of that period. On the retirement of Earl Grey from office in 1834, it is also said that the noble Marquis aspired to the distinction of becoming his successor. How far this is correct I have no means of judging; it is certain that for some days before the construction of Lord Melbourne’s Cabinet, a report was in current circulation, in what are called the “well-informed circles,” that Lord Lansdowne was to be first Lord of the Treasury in the embryo Administration.

Had he attained that eminence, he could not have occupied it long. He is deficient in nerve. He has no energy or decision of character. The first blast of opposition from the Tory side of the House would have scattered his Ministry in all directions. Even if he had had nothing to fear from without, the least symptom of discord or disunion among the members of his Cabinet, would, as

in the case of Lord Goderich's short-lived Administration, have so disconcerted and paralysed him, that his Cabinet must of its own accord have fallen to pieces. He does very well as a follower or assistant, but it is clear Nature never intended him for a leader.

I have spoken of his remarkable fluency as a speaker. His voice is also good : it is clear, and generally pleasant. It possesses considerable flexibility, though he does not always manage it with the best effect. In his efforts at the higher flights of oratory, it is loud and commanding. On all occasions he is audible in every part of the House, and would be so, from his distinct articulation and clear voice, though the House were twice as large. His manner is always full of animation ; his gesture is sometimes redundant, but it can hardly, notwithstanding, be said to be unpleasant. Either of his arms is in constant motion. They generally succeed each other in the office of giving effect to his oratory with wonderful regularity ; in his more energetic moments he uses both at once, raising them as high as they will rise above his head, and then letting them down again by his sides. When labouring under a peculiar warmth of feeling, his voice is raised to so high a pitch, and there is such extravagance in his gesticulation, while there is but

little stamina in his speeches—for on these occasions there is usually least of the latter,—that he reminds one of the Shaksperian expression—“ Full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.”

In the Marquis of Lausdowne's personal appearance there is something striking. His large dark eyelashes, and his projecting eyebrows, give his countenance a peculiar, though by no means unpleasant appearance. His brow is not very well developed, nor can the general expression of his countenance, which is round, be said to be particularly intelligent. His complexion is something of a copper colour, and his hair of a dark brown. He is of the middle size, but of a stout compact make. For one who has entered his fifty-sixth year, he looks healthy and strong. He has now been twenty-seven years in the Upper House, having been raised to the Peerage on the death of his brother in 1809.

The name of Lord DUNCANNON often meets the public eye, but it is chiefly in connexion with the performance of the duties of the office he holds. As a speaker he is very little heard of, nor was he much known as such when a member of the other House. His principles are decidedly liberal, and this circumstance, in conjunction with the consistency he has always shown as a public man, and the excel-

lence of his character in his private capacity, has given to him that weight in the House and that popularity in the country, especially in Ireland, which he possesses. He is one of the worst speakers in either House. He cannot deliver two consecutive sentences, seldom even one sentence, without stammering and correcting himself to an extent which would not only utterly mar the effect of the most brilliant matter to which the human mind ever gave birth, but which is painful for one to hear. The noble Lord, however, has this much in his favour, that he sees himself—which very few others similarly situated do—in the same light, in this respect, as do his brother Peers. He knows, in other words, he is no speaker, and never makes any attempt at oratory. He stands stock still, with his hands on the clerk's table, and delivers the little he has got to say in the best way he can, as if only speaking to some individual member on the opposite side. He always speaks in a low tone, yet with sufficient clearness to be audible in all parts of the House.

He is rather above the middle height, and somewhat stoutly made. His complexion is very fair, and his hair of a white colour. He does not pay undue attention to the fashion, in the article of apparel,—he is rather careless in this respect. His

features are regular, and his face has an oval conformation. Its general expression is that of integrity and good-nature. He looks younger than might be expected in one who has attained the age of fifty-five. His career in the Upper House has only yet been of short duration, having succeeded to the Peerage in 1834.

There are two other Members of the Cabinet in the Upper House, Lord Glenelg and Lord Minto. Of the first I have given a sketch in "Random Recollections of the House of Commons;" the name of the other appears so seldom before the public as not to justify a notice in a work which professes only to embrace the most distinguished Noblemen in the Upper House.

•

CHAPTER XI.

LIBERAL PARTY.—DUKES.

DUKE OF SUSSEX—DUKE OF LEINSTER—DUKE
OF SUTHERLAND.

THE DUKE of SUSSEX, sometimes called, by way of eminence, “the popular member of the Royal Family,” has been very seldom in the House of late years. Physical infirmities, and especially the critical state of his eyes for some time past, are understood to have been the chief causes of his absence. The determined stand which his Royal Highness has on all occasions, even in the worst of times, made on behalf of liberal principles, has greatly endeared him to the great body of the people. The circumstance of the brother of George the Fourth boldly avowing himself the champion of Reform at a time when Toryism was in its palmy state, and when with the very name of a Reformer was associated all that was low, disreputable, and revolutionary,—was one which could not fail to give

the illustrious Duke a striking prominence in the eyes of the country, and to make him a decided favourite with those who shared his sentiments. In fact, he was for many years the great prop and stay of Reform principles in England. His example in fearlessly asserting his opinions under the most disheartening circumstances, in the face of a Ministry, a Court, and a Parliament, in whose eyes the very name of Reform was odious, induced many others, who would else have become the victims of their own despondency and timidity, to go courageously forth, and meet the common foe on the field of battle. Had he, fifteen or twenty years ago, either apostatised from his previous principles, or had any personal affliction occurred which would have sealed his lips and shut him out from intercourse with his fellow-subjects, no one can say to what an extent the cause of Reform would in either case have been retarded.

His Royal Highness is a man of superior talents. It were to over-estimate his abilities to say he is a first-rate man; but no one can deny that his intellectual resources are far above mediocrity. The speeches he used to make some twelve or fifteen years since, both at public meetings and in the House, were as replete with eloquence as they were

remarkable for the ardent love of liberty which they breathed throughout. If there was nothing profound or original in them, neither, on the other hand, did they ever degenerate into dry commonplace. Whether they were heard delivered, or read in the newspapers, they at once gained the attention, and carried the auditor or reader on to the close, without ever flagging for a moment. He excels in putting obvious arguments into a popular form. One of the principal attributes of his speeches is their simplicity. His style is always plain and perspicuous; he makes his views as clear to others as they are to his own mind. No one ever yet mistook the drift of his argument. His reasoning is always clear; it is more clear than forcible. He never takes his audience by storm; he wins them by the attractions of his manner. If you look in vain for any mighty burst of eloquence, carrying you, as if by a resistless torrent, along with it, he never fails to lead you gently on with him in whatever direction he intends to go. His voice is clear and pleasant, but wants strength and flexibility. He never varies the key in which he begins; he is always audible. He is an easy and fluent speaker, never appearing in the least disconcerted, or hesitating a moment, either for ideas or for suitable

terms wherewith to express them. He seldom speaks long at a time, but there is as much matter in most cases in what he says in ten minutes as there is in what the majority of speakers would communicate in twenty. His extemporaneous resources are ample. He can speak with much effect on the impulse of the moment. Indeed his speeches are seldom prepared beforehand.

His literary and scientific attainments are great; with science especially he is intimately conversant. Hence it is that he is president of several eminent scientific societies, and that his name is so often toasted at public dinners in connexion with the various scientific institutions of England.

Every one is struck, wherever he is seen, with the personal appearance of the illustrious Duke. He is one of the tallest and stoutest men, not merely in the House of Lords, but in the country; he is corpulent and pot-bellied. Neither in his appearance or his manners is there anything courtly; indeed though brother of George the Fourth and of William the Fourth, and though residing in this country during the entire regency and reign of the one, and the reign of the other so far as it is passed,—he has hardly ever breathed for one little moment the atmosphere of a court. You see dignity in his appearance; but it is rather the dignity of a noble

mind than that of mere birth. He dresses plainly. Usually he wears a blue coat, light waistcoat, and light knee inexpressibles.

There is something remarkably easy and affable in his manner. I saw him two years ago distributing the prizes at the London University,—after a public examination, in the presence of more than a thousand persons,—awarded to the most distinguished scholars at that institution, and the mildness and affability he evinced on the occasion were the admiration of all present. He cordially shook hands with each of the successful competitors for the prizes,—congratulated them on their literary and scientific acquirements,—and encouraged them to prosecute their studies with unwearied ardour, both because of the gratification they would derive from such studies themselves, and the benefits they would thereby be enabled to confer on society. His countenance beams with good-nature, and with simplicity and sincerity of mind. There is something peculiarly “jolly” in his appearance. The word is a homely one, but I know of none so expressive of the impression which is made on every one’s mind whenever he sees his Royal Highness. His face, like his person, is large and full; his cheeks are particularly prominent, and he has what is called a double chin. His complexion is some-

thing between dark and sallow, and his hair is of a brown colour. He has not, as far as I could perceive, a single wrinkle in his face, though now in the sixty-third year of his age.

The Duke of LEINSTER has been brought before the public of late with some degree of promineney from the accidental circumstance of his being chosen by Lord Melbourne's Government, to move the answer to his Majesty's Speech at the opening of the present Session. In no case is such a choice in either House made because of any supposed intellectual superiority on the part of the individual chosen; in fact, it scarcely ever happens that either the party selected to make or second the motion for an Address to his Majesty, in either of the Houses, has the reputation of a man of talent. The persons chosen—for what reason it is not for me to say—for the purpose, are almost invariably men whose names are but comparatively little heard of as public speakers. The selection of his Grace of Leinster is no exception to the rule. He is not only a nobleman with no pretensions to talent, but he hardly ever opens his mouth on any subject, beyond the simple fact of saying he supports the prayer of any particular petition entrusted to him for presentation. Very little has been heard of him since the time—some six or seven years ago

—when the Duke of Wellington, then Prime Minister, acknowledged the receipt of a petition to his Majesty, from certain Roman Catholics in Ireland, praying for Emancipation, and in these laconic, contemptuous terms,—

“ My Lord Duke,—I have had the honour of receiving the petition you forwarded to me, along with the tin case which enclosed it.

“ I am, my Lord Duke,

“ Your Grace’s most obedient Servant,

“ WELLINGTON.”

His Grace is a poor speaker ; what he says produces no effect : it falls on the ear without making even the most momentary impression. His speech in moving the Address was delivered from memory : he consequently spoke without embarrassment, but there was no animation or energy in his manner. The matter of his speech consisted of a mere expression of approval of the different paragraphs in that of the King. He is understood to be fond of retirement, and is not very regular in his attendance in the House. He is said to have an exquisite taste for music. It is not surprising, therefore, that privately he prefers

the “most sweet music” discoursed by some instrument at home, to the harsh and discordant sounds emitted by speakers on both sides of the House. That, however, does not excuse the irregularity of his attendance, as the individual who undertakes the duties of a legislator, whether chosen to the office by a constituent body, or whether he succeed to it by the accident of birth, ought conscientiously and faithfully to discharge those duties. This is especially to be expected on the part of one who, like his Grace, prides himself on being a Liberal Whig.

The noble Duke is a plain-looking man. He has nothing of the aristocrat about him. His countenance is more remarkable for benevolence of expression than for any other quality. His features are long and moderately marked. His complexion is dark, and his hair, the quantity of which, however, is but limited, owing to a baldness on the crown of his head,—is of a colour between brown and black. He is tall and proportionally made; but the symmetry which his person would otherwise possess, is marred by the stooping conformation of his shoulders. He looks rather younger than he is: he is in the forty-fifth year of his age.

The Duke of SUTHERLAND seldom speaks in the House, but he is a nobleman of great weight among the Liberal party. He is devotedly attached

to the principles of the Whigs of the old school. He was supposed by some to be one of the two Dukes to whom *The Times* referred, during the existence of Sir Robert Peel's Administration, as having said they would give half their extensive estates rather than see the Right Honourable Baronet's Ministry permanently seated in office. His qualifications for public speaking are respectable. He is not showy either in his matter or manner; but there is generally much good sense in the one, and the other is pleasant enough. His utterance is occasionally somewhat slow, and now and then he has to recal a word to substitute one more appropriate in its place. He can hardly be said to be either impassioned or cold in his manner. If you see nothing about him indicative of warmth, you see unequivocal proofs of a sincere and settled attachment to his principles. His voice wants power and flexibility: it is not absolutely harsh, neither is it musical or pleasant in its tones. He usually speaks in a sufficiently loud key to be heard in a room of ordinary dimensions. His gesture is tame: an occasional slow movement of his arms is the only action he employs. His speeches have no pretensions to originality or eloquence; but they are always such as indicate the possession of a well-informed mind, sound

judgment, and the most liberal and generous feeling on the part of the speaker. He does not indulge when he does speak, either in the House or elsewhere, in lengthened orations. He is always brief: his object seems to be to express the greatest possible number of ideas in the least possible number of terms. He always confines himself to the subject under consideration. He never makes a speech for the mere purpose of display. He speaks because he has something to say. Whenever he speaks he invariably commands attention. His style wants elegance, but is nervous. He uses no tropes or figures—he expresses himself in the language which most naturally suggests itself to his mind.

His Grace is about the ordinary height, and is well and compactly made. His countenance has a fine, noble expression, blending dignity with condescension and generosity. His face has something of an angular form. His features are regular and agreeable. His complexion is fair, and his hair of a light brown colour. He is in the meridian of life, being only fifty years of age. He appears to be in excellent health and good spirits. His attendance on his parliamentary duties is not very regular. He is but comparatively seldom in the House, except when some question of very great

importance is before it. He is understood to be, with the exception of the Marquis of Westminster, the richest Peer in the realm. His annual income is estimated at £300,000.

The Duke of CLEVELAND seldom raises his voice in the House. This is a circumstance to be regretted; for he not only acquits himself creditably when he does speak, but it must be manifest to every one who has heard him, that, with a little practice and a little care, he might have earned for himself the reputation of a superior speaker. He has most of the elements necessary to constitute a good speaker. He has a fine voice; it is pleasant in its tones, and he is always sufficiently audible in all parts of the House. It has obviously a much greater flexibility and compass than he has chosen to exhibit in any of his addresses. He is a fluent speaker: his words flow from him with extraordinary copiousness, and it is but seldom the most fastidious ear would find reason to complain of the accuracy of his diction. His manner, indeed, is much better than his matter. In his ideas or arguments there is not often any thing of a superior order. There are few members, perhaps, of either House, in whose speeches you will find a more uniform mediocrity. He seldom rises above it, and still more seldom

does he fall below it. His action is energetic; like the matter of his speeches, it may also be said to be *mediocre*—a something between the awkward and the graceful. In his personal appearance there is nothing striking, unless it be the largeness of his head and features. His hair is of a whitish hue, and his complexion is fair. He is tall, and of a rather robust frame. You would not suppose, from his stout healthy appearance, that he is in his seventieth year.

CHAPTER XII.

LIBERAL PARTY.—MARQUISES.

THE MARQUIS OF WESTMINSTER—THE MARQUIS
OF ANGLESEA—THE MARQUIS OF CLANRICARDE
—THE MARQUIS OF CONYNGHAM.

THE Marquis of WESTMINSTER, late Earl Grosvenor, has been for many years well known for the liberality of his political opinions, and his uncompromising assertion of them. He is also entitled to praise for the straightforwardness and consistency of his conduct as a public man. As a speaker he has few or no pretensions. He has the good sense to know his deficiencies for oratorical exhibitions in the House, and, therefore, very seldom addresses it. His voice is bad; its tones are not pleasant, though they cannot be said to be absolutely disagreeable. His enunciation is far from perfect. He is moderate in the use of gesture; and the little he does call into requisition is any thing but

graceful. He is a nobleman of fair talents; but they can never be made to appear to any advantage in any effort he may make at public speaking; his defects in this respect are too confirmed to admit of even the hope of cure. Even were it only two or three years, instead of more than a quarter of a century, since he was first introduced into public life, there would be no chance of his becoming a good speaker after he had entered his sixtieth year.

The personal appearance of the noble Marquis cannot be called superior. He is tall and slenderly made. His face is of an oblong conformation. His features have something of hardness about them. His complexion is sallow, and his hair of a darkish hue. He is very careless in his dress; sometimes his negligence in this respect verges on the slovenly.

The noble Marquis is the richest individual in the empire. His annual income is little short of that of the Sovereign. It is supposed to be about 1,000*l.* a day; or upwards, speaking in round numbers, of 350,000*l.*; and it is increasing so rapidly, owing to the growing value of his houses in Pimlico, that it is supposed it will, in a few years, be 500,000*l.* per annum,—being considerably above that of Royalty itself.

The Marquis of ANGLESEA, late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, is a nobleman whose name has

for many years been sufficiently familiar to the public eye. He is tall, but slenderly made. His appearance is gentlemanly. You see something about the noble Marquis which somehow or other associates with him the notion of an officer in the army. His complexion is pale, and the general expression of his face is such that he must indeed be an unskilful reader of the human countenance who would not on a single glance perceive that the noble Marquis is frequently the subject of physical pain. For many years he has been subjected to the attacks of a disease which is not uncommon in the aristocratic ranks of life. His hair was formerly of a sandy colour; now it is beginning to get grey. In his features there is nothing remarkable; you are not only prepared by them for the information that he has attained the sixty-eighth year of his age, but you wonder that one, who, in addition to his having reached that advanced period of life, has seen so much active service, should look so well.

Of late years the noble Marquis has not spoken much; formerly he used to speak with some frequency, and was allowed on all hands to acquit himself very creditably. He possesses considerable talents. His judgment generally is sound, and his perceptions are usually quick and clear. He can

state his views on any public question in a very respectable manner; formerly he would have done so with effect. His voice is still excellent; it is at once full, deep, and pleasant. His elocution, however, is occasionally impaired by an undue vehemence of manner when he chances to speak on a subject on which he feels very strongly. On such occasions he "mouths" many of his words. His gesture is also, in such a case, disagreeably redundant; instead of adding to, it takes away from the effect which his observations or arguments would otherwise produce. He has not for some years past been very regular in his attendance on his parliamentary duties; not certainly from any abatement of zeal for his principles or his party, but from the growing infirmities of age, in conjunction with the pain and inconvenience caused by the particular malady to which, as I have already stated, he is subject. He is deeply venerated by all parties for the services he has rendered his country in the field of battle—of which his wooden leg is a never-failing remembrancer.

He is a nobleman of some pretensions to scholarship, though I do not know of any public proof he has given of his acquirements in this way. Lord Brougham, I believe, was the first to apprise the world of the noble Marquis's scholastic attainments,

when he mentioned, in the Session of 1834, that they were in the habit of occasionally corresponding together on learned questions, especially on philological ones, whenever their official duties admitted of the recreation.

The Marquis of CLANRICARDE, son-in-law of the late Mr. Canning, is one of the most promising of the younger members of the Peerage. He has a self-possession, a fearlessness of manner, and an energy in his mode of addressing the House, which are seldom acquired by persons of his age—forty—and in which he is surpassed but by few of the older Peers. His opinions are decidedly liberal and uncompromising on the leading points on which parties differ. His talents are of a superior order, and will, there can be no question, shine forth with still greater splendour when matured by an increased experience in the world of public life. There is much acuteness in his arguments, whether he be exposing the sophistries of an opponent or establishing positions of his own. He is always so clear that no man of the most ordinary comprehension can misconceive what he says. The school-boy who could not follow him from the beginning to the end of his speech, without an effort, would richly deserve a sound flogging. He is not, strictly speaking, brilliant; that is to say, you are not dazzled

or electrified by any thing he says; but you are always pleased, and are generally carried away by his arguments. You see in every thing he says the man of talent. He usually reasons closely, though he sometimes, if I may use the expression, overloads his speeches with arguments. His style is generally correct and elegant; it is free from those meretricious ornaments which usually disfigure the addresses of comparatively inexperienced speakers. Sometimes it is slightly diffuse; but that is a fault which a little time will, in all probability, rectify. He has a fine musical voice, which no one who hears him for a few minutes can fail to perceive is susceptible of most pleasant and effective modulation, though the noble Marquis has not yet in this respect turned it to a proper account. He speaks with much ease and great fluency, never faltering or stammering, or having to pause to correct any inaccuracy of expression. His gesture is not violent; it is gentle and graceful. There are few speakers in the House whom, taken all in all, you can listen to with greater pleasure.

His personal appearance is much in his favour. He is tall and handsome: there are few better formed noblemen in the House. His complexion is swarthy, and his hair of a dark colour; his eyes are black and quick; his features are small and regular.

His forehead is ample, though its full proportions are partly concealed by a large carefully formed ringlet of his hair, which always graces it. In its form, his face is something between the oval and the round. He dresses in the extreme of fashion: he might dispense with a good deal of the labours of the toilet, for Nature has done sufficient for him, seconded, as her efforts have been, by the elevated society in which he has always mixed, to make him appear—as I doubt not he is in reality—one of the most gentlemanly men in the House—without having recourse to any such adventitious aids, or “foreign ornaments,” as Thomson would have called them.

The Marquis of CONYNGHAM's name is more familiar to the public ear from the prominent place his mother occupied in the Court of George the Fourth, than from anything he has said or done himself. Though yet but a young man, being only in his thirty-ninth year, he has evinced in his public conduct a degree of worldly prudence which would do no discredit to the oldest stager in either House. In so far as self-interest is concerned, he has played his cards on all occasions with consummate skill: whether he can claim the merit of having acted on his own suggestions, or whether he acted only agreeably to the advice of his father in the instances to which I refer, is a point on which

I am not in a condition to give my opinion. So long as Toryism was the order of the day in the government of the country, so long did the noble Marquis get credit for being a most exemplary Tory. When in 1832 a change came over the spirit of public affairs, and the odds were in favour of the triumph of the Reform Bill of Earl Grey's Administration, the noble Marquis became also a Reformer, but took special care not to commit himself to "the bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill," until he could weigh more carefully the probabilities for and against its passing. At the second reading of that measure, he contented himself with voting for its principle, reserving to himself the liberty of dealing with it in committee as he thought proper, and rejecting it altogether on the third reading, should it so seem good to him. The bill got through committee essentially in the form in which it was introduced to the House. The noble Marquis saw a large majority passively acquiescing in its provisions, however much they might privately have disapproved of the measure, and he was not the man to offer any opposition to any of its details; these were now as much worthy of all acceptance as was the principle of the bill a few weeks previously. The measure became the law of the land; there was every probability of

Lord Grey remaining in office, and the Marquis of Conyngham became avowedly one of the most strenuous supporters of the noble Earl's government. He now began to turn his eyes towards office. An opportunity of gratifying his ambition to serve the public and himself at the same time, soon presented itself. The Duke of Richmond and three other members of Earl Grey's Administration seceded in 1834, in consequence of their objections to the Church Property Appropriation question, from that Administration, and the noble Marquis, to the surprise of every body, and to none more than to Earl Grey's private friends, was appointed to the office of Postmaster-General in the room of the Duke of Richmond. By what particular influence the noble Marquis procured this appointment, is still at best but matter of conjecture. Certainly it was not from any surpassing sacrifices he had made for reform principles, nor for any services he had done Earl Grey's government; neither could it be because of any expected additional strength which he could impart to it; for he had never given the slightest indication of possessing the talents either of an orator or a statesman. In either of the latter capacities, indeed, his name had hardly ever been heard of; and when his appointment was announced in the public

journals, the universal inquiry was, as Mr. Bulwer, in his "England and the English," remarks, "Who is the Marquis of Conyngham?" It was soon discovered by the successor of Earl Grey in the councils of his sovereign, that the noble Marquis must be got rid of in some shape or other as Postmaster-General, and therefore the first opportunity that presented itself was embraced, of relieving him from the duties and responsibilities of the situation: he was shelved by his appointment to the office of Lord Chamberlain.

The noble Marquis, as will be inferred from what I have mentioned above, is exceedingly sparing of his oratory. The Government of which he is a member has scarcely ever received the benefit of his defence, however strenuously and bitterly attacked by its opponents. He does not open his mouth above once or twice on an average in the course of a Session, and even then he is remarkably economical of his observations. When he does address a few observations to the House, he acquits himself very creditably in so far as the mere mechanism of speaking is concerned. His voice is fine, and his language is easy and correct; but he has no energy in his manner, and no stamina in his matter.

In his personal appearance he is quite a dandy :

I question if he has any equal in this respect in the House. You always see him dressed in the extreme of fashion; were an American to see the noble Marquis, he would "guess" that he spends as much time at his toilet as do the generality of the fair sex. He is vain of the handsomeness of his person, and it must be admitted that in this respect he is perhaps equalled by few noble Lords. He is indeed one of the most handsome men one is in the habit of meeting with. No one can see him without admiring the regularity of his features and the symmetry of his fine tall person. His complexion is dark, and his hair of a hue approaching to jet black; the latter is always most carefully curled and dressed, after a fashion which none but a *friseur* could properly describe.

CHAPTER XIII.

• LIBERAL PARTY.—EARLS.

EARL GREY—EARL OF DURHAM—EARL OF RADNOR
 —EARL OF CARNARVON—EARL MULGRAVE—
 EARL OF BURLINGTON — EARL FIFE — EARL
 FITZWILLIAM.

THE name of EARL GREY is one which has not only of late years occupied a most prominent, perhaps the most prominent, place among his contemporaries, but it is, without question, destined to be better known by posterity than of any other statesman of the present day. The zeal and energy with which, in early life, when a member of the Lower House, he espoused those liberal principles of Reform which he afterwards not only lived to see triumphant, but whose triumph was chiefly brought about by his own instrumentality,—brought his name familiarly before the public upwards of forty years ago; and the un-deviating steadiness with which he adhered, through the whole of his after life, to the principles with

which in the outset he identified himself, notwithstanding the various political vicissitudes of that long and eventful period,—would have procured for him no ordinary reputation in the estimation of unborn generations, though his name had been in nowise associated with the Reform Bill. But it is the circumstance of his having been the author of that great measure, and the Minister under whose auspices it was triumphantly carried through both Houses of Parliament, in defiance of a most decided and powerful Opposition, that gives him that commanding station which he now occupies in the eyes of the country, and which his memory will inevitably occupy in the eyes of future ages.

I doubt if there be a statesman of the present day, no matter of what party, whose public career has been of any length, who has been equally consistent in his opinions and conduct. I am satisfied the history of the country does not afford an instance of a public man having adhered, with such undeviating consistency through an equally protracted and eventful life, to the principles he embraced in his earlier years. The truth was, that Earl Grey, before he appeared in public life, maturely examined the great question of politics in all its branches and bearings; and being a man of sterling integrity of character—as all his

opponents, from the commencement to the close of his public life, have on all occasions been forward to admit—he adopted those opinions which he conceived to be founded in truth and justice, and which he regarded as most adapted to promote the prosperity and glory of his own country, and the happiness of the world at large. And these principles once embraced, no considerations of individual interest could prevail on him in any measure to abandon or compromise them.

It is not to be denied that Lord Grey, on several occasions during the period of his Administration, brought measures into Parliament which did not come quite up to his own individual views, and that on some others he allowed measures to pass after they had been to some extent mutilated by the adverse party. But it must be remembered that the reason, in the first case, was either the impossibility of getting the Members of his Ministry unanimously to concur in his views, or the certainty that, if they did, it would be impracticable to carry the measures, which he might have wished to pass, through both Houses of Parliament. In the other case, he, on several occasions, accepted measures which had been stripped by the Tories of some of what he regarded as their best provisions, because he considered that if, in so doing, he

only procured their concurrence in their principle, he thereby strengthened his own hands, and increased the chances of carrying, at no distant day, perhaps in a Session or two, the very measures, or others as liberal, which had been mutilated. In neither case was there any dereliction of his own principles; no compromise of what he conceived the people's interests. The question with him always was, how far it was practicable, under existing circumstances, to carry out his own individual principles; and whether the concessions which his opponents were willing to make to him were of sufficient extent and importance to justify him in departing, in some measure, from what he conceived the just demands of the people,—especially when the evils of agitation and indefinite delay, in the event of rejecting those concessions,—were taken into the account.

But it was only in reference to questions of secondary importance that he would make even this apparent compromise. In measures involving first principles he would not depart from one iota of what he conceived the abstract right or justice of the case demanded. The Reform Bill is an instance in point. On that great question he took his stand on certain broad principles, from which, neither the threats of the Tory Peers, nor the

seductive solicitations of exalted personages, could induce him to swerve in the slightest degree. Not only did he feel an overwhelming impression of the importance of that measure, but he intended it to be a final one. He consequently saw that to yield to the opponents of the measure on any point of moment, would at once trench on his own consistency, and betray the confidence which the country reposed in him. He therefore determined, without a moment's hesitation, to stake the existence of his Government on the question: he resolved either to stand or fall by the measure he brought forward.

Earl Grey was* a man of sound judgment, and always acted with great deliberation. Before bringing forward any measure, he maturely weighed in his own mind the probabilities of its being carried or rejected. And seldom did his judgment in such cases mislead him. He gauged with wonderful accuracy the amount of opposition which certain measures would have to encounter, and seldom was at fault in the conclusions to which he came, as to whether or not he had the means in his power of overcoming that opposition. To this

* I here speak of the noble Earl in the past tense, because, though still alive, he may be said to be dead as a public man.

is to be ascribed the fact of his carrying so many measures in the face of what to other persons appeared an overwhelming opposition. The contrast, in this respect, between him and his successor, is too striking to have escaped the observation of any person. He carried almost all his measures: Lord Melbourne has lost the majority of those of any importance which he has brought forward.

It is right, however, to add, in justice to Lord Melbourne, that there is not a man in the country, on the same side of politics, nor, perhaps, on the other, who possesses the weight of character which Lord Grey does. His high family connections, his great talents, his unimpeachable integrity, his stainless consistency of public conduct, and his known determination and energy of purpose, all concur to invest him with an importance, and give him a weight of character such as no man of the present day possesses. Neither Lord Melbourne nor any other man but Lord Grey, could have carried the Reform Bill. Earl Grey, for the same reason, could have conducted safely through both Houses some of the measures of Lord Melbourne which have been so signally defeated. I am not sure, however, that had Earl Grey remained in office he would have brought forward equally liberal measures as those which the Melbourne Administration have submit-

ted to Parliament. Lord Melbourne is now more liberal than Earl Grey professed himself to be when in office. Whether the noble Earl would have kept abreast with what the Reformers call the advancing liberality of the age, is a point on which I cannot give any decided opinion. My impression rather is, that he would not.

Earl Grey was a man of great dignity of character. He was noble in mind as well as in name. He would not for worlds have stooped to anything he considered mean or unworthy. It mattered not in his view that his object could have been gained by unbecoming means, without the fact ever coming before the public. It was enough for him that his own mind disapproved of the thing, to ensure his instant determination to reject it. His own inward sense of honour, his consciousness of moral rectitude, was the tribunal to which he appealed in all such cases; and by its decisions he invariably regulated his conduct.

His ministerial career, comparatively short as it was, abounded with instances in which he impaired the strength of his government, and hazarded its existence, to his high sense of honour. A striking one was furnished in the case of Mr. O'Connell and his party, in the Session of 1833. The adhesion of the Irish Liberals was, on that occasion, tendered to

the noble Earl on the condition of his withdrawing what they conceived the harsher clauses of the Coercion Bill; while the most strenuous opposition was threatened as the consequence of rejecting the alternative. Earl Grey spurned the proposal: he would not entertain it for a moment. He disdained to receive support on such conditions. The overthrow of his government was, in his estimation, an evil of infinitely less magnitude than such an alliance. And when, in the Session of 1834, Mr. Littleton, now Lord Hatherton, confidentially communicated to Mr. O'Connell the intentions of Ministers with regard to Ireland, it is well known that the noble Earl was annoyed at the circumstance in the highest degree, and denounced the Member for Dublin, in his place in the House of Lords, as a person with whom no member of his government ought to have had any correspondence or communication.

Earl Grey was dignified in his manner as well as in his mind. This was apparent the moment you saw him. No one ever yet glanced his eye at the noble Earl without being that instant struck with the dignity of his appearance. There was dignity in his looks and in every movement he made. It was still more visible when he rose to speak. Apart from the exalted station he filled in the

councils of the King, and the large space he filled in the public eye—for my observations are confined to the period during which he was First Lord of the Treasury—there was something in his aspect and demeanour the moment he began to speak which could not fail to attract all eyes towards him, and command the deepest attention.

With the dignified expression of his countenance, there was blended a deep-seated habitual gravity, and a profoundly thoughtful air. He scarcely ever—and never except in very peculiar circumstances—spoke on any other than questions of the deepest importance. When he began his speech he usually did so in so low a tone as to be hardly audible twelve or fourteen yards distant. His utterance in the outset was slow, and his manner partook a good deal of the gravity of his appearance. As he advanced, his voice gradually rose in the distinctness of its tones, till he became perfectly audible in all parts of the House, including the space outside the bar, and the space behind the Throne, set apart for members of the other House. But though thus sufficiently audible when he got into the midst of his subject, he never spoke in what could be called a loud tone. His voice was soft and pleasant, and his articulation clear. He could moderate his voice at pleasure, and generally did

so with great judgment and effect. He was not a showy speaker: there was nothing of a clap-trap character in his oratory; but he was always graceful and correct, as well as dignified. The tones of his voice often indicated strong feeling and considerable animation; his action hardly ever. He seldom made any use of his arms when speaking. His usual practice was to join his hands, and then allow them to repose on his person for eight or ten minutes. He would then separate them, and after suffering them to hang loose by his side, would put both to his back, where he would again join them, and continue in that attitude for other eight or ten minutes. Beyond this, he seldom made any use of his arms when addressing the House. In his person, otherwise, he made a good many movements. When speaking with unwonted warmth or energy, he seldom stood many seconds on the same spot, or presented to the House the same attitude. He would first advance two or three steps towards the centre of the House, and then retrace them. At one time he turned his face in the direction of the Lord Chancellor on the Woolsack immediately before the Throne; at another, you saw his back to the Woolsack, and his face towards the bar. When addressing their Lordships, he never looked any of them in the face: his eyes were usually fixed on

the floor, or on some of the benches, a few feet from where he stood.

Lord Grey's matter was always excellent. You saw the man of superior talent in every sentence he uttered. I have said his judgment was sound ; his mind was also vigorous and acute. He never took a narrow or one-sided view of any question : he viewed it in all its bearings.

The felicity of his replies was the admiration of every one who ever heard him answer an opponent ; and the wonder was how, on a moment's notice, he could so triumphantly demolish the positions of an adversary. I account for this in a great measure from the circumstance I have just mentioned of his having previously surveyed the subject in all its relations. This enabled him to anticipate the line of argument which the Opposition would most probably take, and of course afford him a previous opportunity of preparing himself for a triumphant refutation of the objections which would be urged to his measures. At the same time, every one must admit that one of the leading attributes of his mind was a quickness of perception, joined to a remarkable readiness and felicity of expression. I never knew a man whose replies were so complete, without being redundant. He had, above any speaker I ever heard in either House of Parliament, or anywhere

else, the happy knack of urging everything necessary for the triumphant establishment of his case, without adding one superfluous word. It was undoubtedly in reply that he excelled. In making a set speech, he was always clear in his statements, sound in his reasonings, ample in his illustrations without overlaying them, and correct in his style; but you missed the warmth, the animation, the originality of conception, and the eloquence, which always characterised his replies to a talented opponent.

Earl Grey never appealed to the passions of noble Lords. What he aimed at was to convince their judgments of the propriety and justice of the measures he brought forward. Strong in the consciousness of the purity of his motives, and deeply impressed with the reasonableness and necessity of the course of policy he pursued, he thought that if any particular measure was brought fairly and dispassionately under the consideration of his brother Peers, it could not fail to command their inward approbation and outward concurrence. To attempt to intimidate their Lordships into an assent to his measures, by depicting the probable consequences of their rejection, was an expedient in political tactics to which he never had recourse. Indeed, Earl Grey could hardly be called a politician in

the proper acceptation of the term; for he knew nothing of those tricks and stratagems so often employed by others, whether Whigs or Tories, who have been called on to fill the same situation, with a view to preserve or strengthen their Government.

Lord Grey was at all times careful to avoid personalities when speaking of noble Lords on the opposite side of the House. I do not remember that any of his opponents ever accused him of making use of personal allusions. Nor was he himself, to the best of my recollection, the subject of personalities on the part of his opponents. As already hinted, there was something in the very appearance of the man which could not fail to disarm all such unworthy hostility. They were always forward to avow their most cordial esteem for him privately, however much they were compelled to differ with him in regard to his measures.

To say that Earl Grey was altogether indifferent towards the approbation of his fellow men, would be to say of him what could not, with truth, be said of any man who has the ordinary feelings of human nature in his bosom. But I believe there are few men who would be more ready to sacrifice their popularity to their principles, when the neces-

sity arose, than the noble Earl at all times was. Grateful as the approbation of his fellow-subjects must have been to his mind,—as it must and ought to be to the mind of every man,—he never allowed the acquisition or forfeiture of that approbation to weigh a feather in the scale when framing his measures. He resolved on acting according to his views of justice and necessity, not doubting that the cause he adopted would eventually commend itself to the mind of every intelligent reflecting person.

Perhaps few Ministers have ever had to carry on the government of any country amidst such formidable difficulties as those with which the noble Earl had to contend. He was placed betwixt two great parties—the one great in underhand influence, and the other great both in numbers and moral power. I refer to the Court party on the one hand, and to the people on the other. The views and interests of these * were wide as the poles asunder. The one pulled one way, the other another. The one called and intrigued for more moderate measures, the other urged him to move more rapidly in an onward course; and when he

* It is not to be denied that a numerical majority of the nation were latterly dissatisfied with the measures of Earl Grey, and were anxious to see his Administration displaced by one of a more liberal character.

triumphed over the intrigues of the one, and would not quicken his pace to meet the views of the other, both secretly wished, and assiduously laboured, for his overthrow. Both, however, laboured in vain. When his government fell, it was because of internal divisions, not from the intrigues or attacks of open foes.

The breaking up of Lord Grey's government, however, was not in itself a source of mortification to the noble Earl—though he must have felt acutely the indiscretion of some of its members—for he had long wished to retire from public life. That he entertained this wish long before he came to the resolution of resigning into the hands of His Majesty the seals of office, was well known to all his private friends. A large portion both of the press and public thought differently; and at the very time his desire to get rid of the anxieties of power and retire into the privacy of domestic life was felt in its greatest force, he was day after day, hour after hour, charged with clinging to office with an undue tenacity of grasp.

Though aristocratic in no ordinary degree, Lord Grey was sensibly alive to the finer feelings of human nature. He admired those qualities in others which formed the leading features in his own character. Lord Althorp, because of his pro-

verbal honesty of purpose and straightforwardness of manner, was perhaps the man, of all others associated with him in the Cabinet, he most esteemed. It is certain that towards the noble Lord he entertained the most unfeigned respect; and hence, on Lord Althorp's secession from his government, he felt very much in the same way as if he had sustained a personal bereavement. The kindnesses, too, which were shown him by the King produced an overpowering impression on his mind. When he rose to make his farewell speech, as a Minister of the Crown, his feelings quite overcame him. After standing for some time, without uttering a word, he was obliged to resume his seat; and it was not until a glass of water was brought him, that he was able to commence his address.

In dealing with the Opposition, Earl Grey was remarkable for his fairness. He would have scorned to take any undue advantage of an opponent, however great the temptation which such opponent's speech held out to him to do so. He is the only man of any note in either House whom I do not recollect to have ever heard charged with misrepresenting what had fallen from the speakers on the opposite side. That high sense of honour and honesty, to which I have before alluded, was always sufficient to prevent his availing himself of any

advantage which such adventitious circumstances would have afforded to his cause. He always sought to ground the success of his measures on their own inherent merits.

His language was beautifully correct, without being what is called elegant. His periods were well turned, but they had nothing ornamental about them. His style united simplicity with vigour in no ordinary degree. Both his ideas and expressions were so clear, that it was impossible for any one to mistake his meaning.

He was not so insensitive to the attacks of his opponents as was generally supposed. Those who knew him intimately, were well aware that his sensibilities in this respect were not blunted by the cares and anxieties of office. But he had great command over his temper. His philosophy had taught him the great advantages to a man holding so important a situation as he did, of concealing any soreness he might feel from the conduct of an opponent. He knew that to betray a loss of temper at the attacks of the adverse party, was precisely the way to invite a repetition of such attacks. He therefore resolved to subject his temper in this respect to a severe course of discipline. He successfully carried his resolution into effect.

I am inclined to think that his temper was easily

irritated; and I have on two or three occasions seen it burst through all the restraints he had imposed upon it. But I do not recollect having seen him betray any great loss of temper at any particular speech, or part of a speech, of an opponent. When I have witnessed the noble Earl's usual equanimity disturbed, it has always been at what he conceived the factious opposition which the Tories offered to his policy generally. In the Session of 1834, a short time before he retired from the councils of his Majesty, he expressed himself with considerable warmth and irritation at the circumstance of the Tories harassing and thwarting his government by bringing forward motion after motion in opposition to his measures,—while they refused to press those motions to a division, as that would have displaced a government which they themselves were not prepared to succeed.

Lord Grey has a great deal of the aristocrat about him. He is proud of his title: he rejoices in the long line of an illustrious ancestry. He appreciates learning and talent; but the nobility of nature could never in his eyes atone for the want of the nobility of name. I question whether the most unintellectual nobleman in the realm was not a far greater man, in his estimation, than Sir Walter Scott. In his manners there was a good deal of

this aristocratic feeling visible. Most persons who have had occasion to meet with him, have observed a certain distancy and reservedness about him. It was the same feeling that made him openly avow, in his place in Parliament, that if a conflict should happen to take place between his order and the people, he would stand or fall by his order; in other words, he would sacrifice the interests of the whole nation to the preservation of a mere artificial distinction to about four hundred individuals moving in the same rank of society as himself.

Lord Grey seldom carried on any conversation, when in the House, with his colleagues in office. He invariably sat at the end, furthest from the Throne, of the front bench, on the right hand of the Lord Chancellor, in the centre of the House. That, indeed, is the seat appropriated to the Prime Minister and his colleagues, in the Lords; but from the position in which he almost invariably placed himself, he was to all intents and purposes alone while in the House. His left leg was generally placed over his right, while his head rested on his hand, and his elbow on the back of the bench; his back was consequently towards his colleagues, so that the one nearest to him could carry on no conversation with him. The noble Earl evidently had a disinclination to conversation in the House. One

reason may have been that constitutional reserve to which I have referred already as being so visible to all who ever had any intercourse with him, and which was often evinced in his interviews with even his colleagues in office. Another, and most probably the principal reason, I take to be, that he was particularly anxious to watch with the closest attention the proceedings in the House, which he could not have done had he engaged in conversation either with his colleagues or with any other Peer. Whether I am right in this conjecture or not, this much was clear, that never had any member of that House a more vivid impression of what was said and done by others than he had. His replies to his opponents afforded ample proof of this; for not only, as I before remarked, did no Opposition Peer ever, as far as I can recollect at this moment, accuse him of misrepresenting what he said, but he generally gave their own phraseology as well as their own sentiments.

I spoke in a previous part of this sketch of the habitual gravity or seriousness of appearance of the noble Earl. Whether this was constitutional, or whether it was chiefly to be ascribed to the combined effects of a deep sense of the responsibility of his situation, and his advanced age—he is now in his seventy-second year—I have no means of

knowing, not having been in the way of seeing him before he was called to preside over the councils of his Sovereign. Of this I am certain, that never was a Prime Minister more thoroughly imbued with a conviction of the responsibility of that station, than was the noble Earl. All his conduct showed this. I have already stated that he never engaged in rash legislation; and his speeches invariably proved, that in framing his measures he had always his eye on their probable, though it should be remote, consequences, as well as on those which were certain and immediate. He held himself accountable to posterity as well as to the present generation for the measures he brought forward. It was clear to every one in the habit of seeing him, that for the last twelve months he was in power, he was most anxious to be relieved of the responsibilities of office; though, as already stated, the Journals adverse to his government reproached him with clinging to it with an undue tenacity of grasp. This, indeed, is well known, for on retiring from the councils of his Majesty he publicly mentioned that he had often expressed that wish to his private friends. It was evident that his bodily powers were gradually sinking. The opinion of many, as well as myself, was, that in the Session of 1834, his frame was yielding so perceptibly to his

intense mental anxiety, that, had he struggled much longer against it, nature must have given way in the effort. His intellectual powers, however, were as vigorous as ever—his views were as enlightened and comprehensive—his judgment was as sound—and his perception as quick. A more feeling or able speech—a speech in better taste in the delicate circumstances in which he was placed—was, perhaps, never made, than the one he delivered when announcing to his brother Peers that his Majesty had accepted his resignation as First Minister of the Crown.

Lord Grey is somewhat above the middle size, and of slender form for one of his advanced age. Of late his accumulated years have given him something of a crouching appearance; but he walks with a tolerably quick and firm step. His countenance, as I have already intimated, indicates deep thought, mingled with an expression of melancholy. His eyes are small, but beam with intelligence. In the latter respect they harmonize with his finely developed ample forehead. His features are small and regular, and the wrinkles the finger of time has left on his face are neither so numerous or deep as might be expected in one who has not only seen so many years pass over his head, but of whose protracted existence so large a part has been occupied with matters of the deepest

importance, and which must of necessity have been the source of the deepest anxiety to his mind. His complexion presents a mixture of ruddiness and paleness. What the original colour of his hair may have been, I know not; now it is of a light grey, made so by the number of years which have stolen over his head.

Earl Grey has been only once or twice in the House since he ceased to be Prime Minister; and there is very little probability, from his known partiality to the privacy of domestic life, of his again ever crossing its threshold. As, however, he seems to be wonderfully healthy in body for a man of his age, as well as vigorous in mind, there is reason to hope he may yet be spared some years to enjoy that repose in the bosom of his family which the prominent part he acted in the theatre of public life denied him until within the last twelve months.

Lord DURHAM is the great and only hope of the Movement party. They look forward with confidence to his accession, at no distant day, to the Premiership, and associate with this anticipated event the political regeneration of the country. His personal appearance and manners are by no means of that kind which one usually pictures out in his mind when endeavouring to form a conception of the genuine Radical. With the "Radicals of the

right sort"—I use their own phraseology—one always associates a certain rudeness of manner and a boldness approaching to ferocity of countenance. Lord Durham has neither of these qualities. His countenance has a pleasing, conciliatory, modest expression. There is something, indeed, feminine in it. You would fancy he was so timid as not to be able to muster sufficient courage to open his mouth in public; and nothing can be more gentlemanly than his demeanour. He is a good-looking man; of dark complexion, and of small and regular features. His eyes assimilate to the deep blue; they are small, but piercing. His eyelashes are prominent, from the jet-black colour of his hair. His face is something between the round and oval form. He is of the middle height, and is handsomely formed.

His Lordship's political opinions are of the most liberal and uncompromising kind. I question if there be a member of the Upper House—with the single exception, perhaps, of Lord Radnor—who carries his Liberalism to the same extreme. He has declared himself for household suffrage, triennial Parliaments*, and the vote by ballot. There is not

* It is understood the noble Lord would prefer annual Parliaments, though he thinks triennial, with household suffrage and vote by ballot, would secure cheap and good government.

perhaps a single member, of either party, in the House whose public life has been more straightforward and consistent throughout. On no occasion has he deviated from the principles with which he committed himself when he appeared, in his twenty-first or twenty-second year, in the House of Commons, as Mr. John George Lambton. And his conduct has always been in accordance with his principles. He has uniformly supported by his votes the opinions which he has maintained in his speeches. He holds there ought to be no such principle in politics as expediency, and disclaims all sympathy with those who recognise that principle. He maintains that whatever is deemed right ought to be done without regard to circumstances or consequences. He is on the Liberal side what the Duke of Newcastle and others are on the Tory side,—denouncing all trimming, and contending that his principles ought at once to be carried into full effect.

Without deserving to be regarded as a man of genius, his talents are undoubtedly of a very high order. If you look in vain in his speeches for that brilliant eloquence which carries you away with him, as if spell-bound, wherever he chooses to conduct you,—you never fail to be delighted with him. He is always eloquent in a high, though not

the highest, degree. He never becomes dull or heavy: he cannot make a bad speech; at least he never has yet done so. He is, perhaps, one of the most equal men in the matter of his speeches, in either House. Lord Brougham and other distinguished members often make splendid speeches, but then they are comparatively dull on other occasions. Lord Durham scarcely ever varies either way to any perceptible extent, except where the subject of necessity precludes the possibility of an effective speech. Whenever he rises, if the subject will admit of it, you may rest assured that you will hear a speech of superior ability and of considerable eloquence. His matter is always argumentative: I am not sure if there be a more close and powerful reasoner, taking his speeches on the whole, on either side of the House. He deals little in generalities, and scarcely ever utters a declamatory sentence. With one or two introductory observations he dashes into the midst of the subject, and at once proceeds, if his speech be not in reply to some opponent, to establish, by a course of logical reasoning, some position which he had indicated in the first two or three sentences. If speaking in reply, which he generally does, he loses no time in proceeding to the principal arguments of his adversary, with which he grapples with a boldness

and success not often to be witnessed. He is a formidable opponent: very few on the opposite side encounter him, if they can help it. Not that they apprehend any thing in the shape of personalities—for in these he does not indulge—but simply because they know he is likely to cause the speeches on which they may have prided themselves, and which otherwise might have passed off for happy efforts, to cut a sorry figure,—by the mere force of argument. Of late, however, the Opposition may be said to have had it all their own way in so far as relates to his Lordship. For the last three Sessions, he has only made one or two speeches worthy of the name. His absence from the country in the service of his Sovereign, and a depression of spirits, with impaired bodily health, caused in a great measure by family calamities,—have conjointly had the effect of excluding him almost entirely from the House for the last three years. At present there is little prospect of his being in his place in Parliament during the current Session.

His style, though by no means remarkable for its force, is anything but feeble: it is correct and perspicuous, and has that sort of energy which arises from the ideas rather than from peculiarity in the construction of his sentences. It is always

clear: you are never at a loss for a moment to perceive the object the speaker has in view; nor can you fail to see the means which appear to him most likely to accomplish it. Every argument he uses is felt by you in all its cogency; and not only do you perceive the force of the argument itself, but you cannot withhold from him your admiration of the way in which he has enforced it.

His extemporaneous resources are ample, and he trusts entirely to them, excepting in those cases in which the duty may devolve on him of introducing a measure embracing various details and involving some important principle. In that case he takes, as almost all members of either House do, notes of the leading points to which he means to advert in the course of his speech. It is only in these cases, and to this extent, that he prepares himself previous to his speaking in the House. His confidence in his powers of improvisation has never, on any occasion, turned out to be misplaced. His utterance is always prompt and easy. No one ever yet saw him at a loss, either for an idea, or for suitable language wherewith to express it. In the stores of a correct and copious diction, he is in affluent circumstances. His style is always excellent. Occasionally, perhaps, it were better, in so

far as regards effect, if it were not so smooth: the polish sometimes impairs the vigour. In the artifices of rhetoric he deals little, or rather none at all. There is nothing forced, either in his ideas or language. His sentiments seem, as it were of their own accord, to suggest themselves to him, rather than to be searched for, or called into existence by close or profound meditation. It is the same with his language. The polish of which I have spoken, is not the polish of the midnight lamp: it is not the fruit of elaboration: with him it is as much a habit to speak in correct and polished language, as it is to argue logically. He never has recourse to the clap-traps of the mere orator. Never was man more thoroughly impressed with the truth and utility of his principles, than is Lord Durham with the truth and utility of those which he holds. This conviction presses on his mind with an overpowering force. You see the most perfect sincerity in every thing pertaining to his manner. The tones of his voice, his gesture, his very looks, all proclaim it. This, with a constitutional aversion to any thing having the resemblance of trick or clap-trap, causes him to address himself principally, if not exclusively, to the judgment of his audience. Every one who has

perused his speeches with ordinary attention must have been struck with the vein of close and powerful argument which pervades them from beginning to end.

His Lordship's elocution is good: occasionally, for the reason I have mentioned, it is not sufficiently impassioned. His voice is soft and pleasant; it is clear in its tones, but has very little flexibility. He is always audible. His delivery has what may be called a slight rapidity. His manner is graceful: the little gesture he uses is natural, and the tranquil champaign of his face is seldom troubled by anything in the shape of undue warmth or excitement. This is perhaps the more remarkable, as he is well known to be of an irritable temperament. To see his calm, unassuming manner, nothing would convince you that he possessed sufficient nerve or decision of character to utter half a dozen sentences in the hearing of a public assembly. How great, then, must be your surprise when you observe from the tones of his voice, and the uncompromising character of his principles, that he is one of the firmest and most determined men in either House. He never trims, or minces his creed, though he knows, not only that the three hundred and odd Peers on the opposite side, regard it with absolute

abhorrence, but that the seventy or eighty who sit on the same side with him, view them as alike ultra and impracticable. In the face of an audience so constituted, Lord Durham stands up as erect and resolute as if he were going to harangue the most purely and unredeemably-Radical assemblage which ever congregated together. Nothing can flurry or put him down. There is not a man of stronger nerve in the House.

It is his misfortune, as I have already stated, to be under the government of an ill-disciplined temper. His irritable disposition has, in one or two cases, led him into false positions. It is to this cause that the prosecutions he instituted two or three years ago against several of the newspapers are to be ascribed. When the momentary irritation was over, he at once abandoned these prosecutions. It is right, however, to mention that his conduct in the House has never afforded any indication of a fiery temper. There he is always cool and collected in his manner, and respectful, though decided, in the language in which he expresses himself towards an opponent.

His Lordship was the framer of the first Reform Bill, which every one knows was of a much more liberal character than the measure which is now the law of the land. That a man of Earl Grey's

caution should have entrusted his son-in-law * in the execution of so important a task, shows the high opinion he must have entertained of the soundness of his judgment as well as the superiority of his talents. Lord Durham is a young man to be in the House of Peers, being only in the forty-fourth year of his age.

The Earl of RADNOR is distinguished from all other noble Lords by the ultra liberalism of his opinions. He is the nearest approach to a perfect Radical in the House. For many years—for the last twelve or fifteen at least—he was not only a devoted admirer of Cobbett's opinions and writings, but an ardent friend to him personally. Cobbett used to say his Lordship was the only nobleman who understood the first principles of politics, and that his were the only speeches in the Upper House worth a moment's attention. Lord Brougham, even as a man of talent, was not worthy of being compared with the Earl of Radnor. When Cobbett started as candidate for the representation of some town, the name of which I now forget, in 1828, Lord Radnor evinced the interest he felt in his success by subscribing 50*l.* to assist in defraying the expenses of the election. Cobbett, however,

* Lord Durham is married to one of Earl Grey's daughters.

was unsuccessful in his appeal to the constituency of the borough in question.

Lord Radnor's talents are above mediocrity, but they are not of a very superior order. He never rises to originality or eloquence. You would call his arguments good, and his language perspicuous and correct, but you cannot concede much higher praise to him. His manner is always clear; he never loses sight of his subject, and you never lose sight of him. He never misconceives or misrepresents another; and no man, unless he does so wilfully, can either misunderstand the positions he undertakes to establish, or the arguments by which he seeks to accomplish his object. He displays tact in the way in which he puts his case; he omits nothing that is essential to it—I exclude, of course, anything ingenious or brilliant—and he takes care that he does not weaken it by superfluous argumentation. A man that really wishes to have a clear notion of the view which the party with whom he acts take of a given subject, ought to hear or read Lord Radnor's speeches in preference to those of any other Peer in the House. He feels strongly on most political questions, and his ardour of feeling causes him to forget himself in his subject. He cares comparatively little what you think of himself, if he can only persuade you to adopt his view

of the subject. This observation applies to his politics generally; it applies with special force in reference to his principles respecting the Church and Dissenters. Judging from the zeal he has always evinced in his efforts to bring about the repeal of all disabilities caused by dissent from the Church, he is a greater friend to religious than civil liberty. His strenuous exertions for the removal of the Catholic disabilities are known to all; so also are his zealous and unremitting efforts for the repeal of the 'Test and Corporation Acts. These two measures being carried into effect, he has of late applied himself, with an ardour which nothing can damp, to get rid of certain well-known oaths which every person must take who graduates at the English Universities, and which, he maintains, prove, in a majority of cases, to be a species of perjury. On the subject of excluding Dissenters from the University of Oxford, he also feels strongly; and he never lets an opportunity slip of pouring out the vials of his wrath on the Church, because of her intolerance in this respect. He possesses great moral courage; and has again and again fearlessly encountered the hostile front which the Bench of Bishops always assumes, when the exclusive privileges of the Church, or her alleged impropriety of conduct, are discussed in the House. He equally

disregards their implied anathemas because of the alleged impiety of seeking to lay hands on the Church, and the open denunciations of perdition which are hurled at his head by Lords Winchelsea, Roden, and other Peers of the same class of opinions on matters directly pertaining to the Protestant Establishment.

His voice is excellent: it is rich and full in its tones, and possesses much flexibility, though he does not often make any effort to turn its capabilities to advantage. He does not, in general, speak in a loud key, but always sufficiently so to be distinctly heard in all parts of the House. His utterance is, if anything, slow; but it falls pleasantly on the ear. He does not stammer, and seldom is at a loss for a word. He proceeds easily and with considerable fluency, once he is fairly into his subject, until he resume his seat. His speeches are usually short; indeed the strictness with which he confines himself to the leading points bearing on the subject, necessarily insures brevity. His gesture is monotonous and moderate. He stands in pretty much the same position—with his face to the Lord Chancellor—from the time he begins till he resumes his seat. He raises and lowers his right arm with some rapidity, but does not embrace a great sweep in its movements. Lord Radnor's

personal appearance is commanding ; and with his fine voice and good matter it would, with a little more energy and animation of manner, make him an effective speaker. He is tall and well made : his frame has every appearance of robustness about it ; and the glow of health is visible in his countenance. His features, which are regular, wear an expression of firmness, mingled with considerable composure of mind. His face inclines to the oval shape. His complexion is sallow, and his hair of a greyish colour. No one would suppose, forming his opinion from the personal appearance of Lord Radnor, that he was so far advanced in life as his fifty-seventh year.

The Earl of CARNARVON is a young man of very great promise ; his maiden speech, a few years since, almost electrified the House, and his subsequent efforts as an orator and senator have certainly not disappointed the expectations which his success on that occasion inspired. He speaks with great fluency, and his language is always correct, often eloquent. His voice is strong and flexible, but he does not at all times give it full scope. It is only occasionally that he furnishes their Lordships with a proof of its capabilities. His utterance is in good taste : it is neither too rapid nor too slow. His gesture is animated, but not extravagant. Alto-

gether he is a tolerably graceful speaker. You see such an earnestness and such a visible sincerity in his manner, that you cannot fail to be pleased with him, however much you may disapprove of his principles, or however much you may dissent from his arguments. His matter is always good. He is free from the sin which generally attaches to young speakers, namely, that of being wordy. His sentences are tastefully constructed; sometimes they are polished to a degree that weakens their native force; but still you can never accuse him of quackery. Your mind is always more intently fixed on the idea than on the mere phraseology which expresses it. He seldom clothes the progeny of his brain in any gaudy or meretricious apparel: he may, in this respect, be said to be in the fashion, without being a dandy. You recognise the man of talent in every sentence he utters. If he seldom rises into the regions of genius, you never detect him descending to common-place. He does not startle or overwhelm you by some striking or brilliant conceptions; but he arrests your attention the instant he rises, and it is not in your power to withdraw it for a moment, until he has thought fit to resume his seat. His speeches are often full of powerful argument. He usually reasons with great

closeness, and with logical precision. His illustrations are, for the most part, ample and happy; he takes a careful and comprehensive view of his subject before he utters a syllable upon it. There are few men on either side of the House, or in either House, who see their way more clearly, and who are, consequently, less liable, to use a familiar phrase, to be caught tripping. He, who on the opposite side of the House, volunteers an answer to the noble Earl's speech, undertakes a task, the difficulties of which he will not find to disappear the more the nearer he approaches it. The noble Earl is a man of considerable literary reputation; he has published several tragedies and volumes of travels, which have met with a favourable reception from the public.

His personal appearance is against him: he is rather above the usual height, but sparely, and, to all appearance, weakly made. His face has much in it of the conformation and expression of that of a Jew: his nose is particularly like that of a descendant of Abraham. A stranger meeting him in the streets would immediately set him down as of Jewish origin, if not a Jew, in point of fact. His face, like his body, is thin: his eye-sight is not good; and he is, consequently, obliged to wear spectacles. His

complexion is dark, and his hair of a colour nearly approaching to jet black. He is in his thirty-sixth year. He has of late opposed the Whigs, but as he commenced his career as a Reformer, and still professes to be one, I have placed his name among the liberal Peers.

Earl MULGRAVE, the present Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, has rendered himself extremely popular among the Roman Catholics and Liberal Party, since his accession to that office. They were never so well satisfied with the administration of any previous Viceroy. As a speaker in the House of Lords the noble Earl cannot be said to be well known. It is his own fault that he is not more. He is a nobleman of considerable talents, and of a highly cultivated mind. He wants depth of thought and vigour of expression; but it is impossible to hear him speak without perceiving that he possesses a mind of considerable acuteness; while every sentence proves that he has studied with success the art of graceful or elegant composition. His style, when addressing the House, resembles, in some degree, the diction of his well-known novels of "Matilda," "Yes or No," &c. It has much of the diffuseness, with some of the floweriness which characterise that of his works of fiction. His speeches abound with metaphors and with quota-

tions from well-known authors, especially poets. His speeches are not remarkable for closeness or power of argument; though, on occasions, I have heard him make some happy efforts in that way: neither does he throw much new light on the view of the subject which he takes. The matter of his speeches is most meritorious for its clearness of conception, and the ease and felicity with which he expresses his sentiments. You never lose sight of the point to which he wishes to conduct you; neither are you tired of his guardianship. There is something winning in his manner; he is one of those to whose company you get attached, and with whom you like to travel the way, even should you differ with each other.

The noble Earl was, some years ago, a good-looking man: since that time he has altered considerably to the worse. Still you see in his face and general appearance, the remains of what, in speaking of a lady, would be called former personal attractions. His complexion is sallow, and the expression of his countenance is that of a person in an impaired state of health. His hair is black, and is always formed into a profusion of curls; whether this be nature's handy-work, or the result of the *friseur's* skill, I have no means of knowing. His eye is quick, and has something

very expressive of intelligence. His face inclines to the elongated form. From his appearance you would infer his age was at least forty-five, though it is only thirty-nine.

The Earl of BURLINGTON'S name may be said to have been, for the first time, brought before the public by the circumstance of his being selected to second the late Address to his Majesty. That was his maiden speech in the House; but as it was carefully prepared, and was spoken entirely from memory, it does not afford any materials by which to judge of his talents. His voice is fine: it is clear and pleasant, and apparently possesses considerable compass; but in this instance he did not give it sufficient scope to enable me to form a judgment of the full extent of its capabilities. His elocution was also in many respects entitled to much commendation; but before he had spoken two or three sentences, it must have been apparent to all who heard him that he had not yet got rid of the formality and stiffness of school. His oratory had all the characteristics of a recitation at some annual academical exhibition. In regard to talent, there was not much to admire in the noble Earl's speech; but it would be unfair to estimate his abilities, under any circumstances, by the success of a first effort: it would be especially so

in such a case as the present, when he was, by a sort of implied necessity, bound down to certain topics, and a certain manner of adverting to them. He is undoubtedly a young nobleman of great promise in so far as his career at the University of Cambridge is concerned. From that university he carried away the highest honours. If his abilities as an orator and legislator should be but nearly equal to his talents as a scholar, he cannot fail to rise to great distinction; and should his present prospect of succeeding to the title and estates of the Duke of Devonshire be realized, the influence which his talents will necessarily insure to him, will be greatly increased by the accident of his filling the highest station in society to which a subject can be raised.

In person he is about the ordinary size, and of a handsome make. His features are regular and pleasing. The form of his face inclines to roundness. The expression of his countenance is that of intelligence and mildness. His complexion is slightly tinged with ruddiness, and his hair is of a darkish hue. His appearance is gentlemanly. As he is only in his twenty-eighth year, and has only been a very short time in the House, his career as a senator will be watched with interest for some years to come

Though Lord FIFE's name very seldom comes before the public eye in his capacity of a member of the Legislature, it is one with which every body is familiar. The noble Earl was first brought prominently into notice in 1820, under the Castle-reagh dynasty, in consequence of his dismissal by that Minister from the office of Lord of the Bed-chamber, because, in compliance equally with the wishes of his constituents and the dictates of his own conscience, he had the moral courage to vote * in opposition to the then Administration, for a repeal of the Malt Tax. The dismissal of Lord Fife, under the circumstances in which it took place, from the office in question, excited much interest at the time in the public mind. It was looked upon as a tyrannical act, especially as the noble Lord almost invariably supported the Ministry who practised it towards him. A sort of portrait of his Lordship, roughly executed, but a happy likeness, was soon after to be seen in the window of every print-seller in the country, under the rather happy title of "The Discharged Fife-er." The publicity which the circumstances connected

* The noble Lord was at this time a member of the House of Commons.

with his dismissal from the above office gave his name, had hardly begun to die away, when it was again brought prominently forward in connection with the name of a very popular actress, to whom he was said to be warmly attached. Of late, his Lordship has chiefly spent his time in retirement, at his seat in Banffshire, in the north of Scotland, and consequently his name has not been so frequently before the public.

He is a man of liberal principles; he steadily supported the administration of Earl Grey during its four years' existence; he never, however, so far as I recollect, made more than one speech during that time: that speech was not on any question before the House, but only on his presentation, in 1832, of a petition from Keith, a small town in the north of Scotland, in favour of Reform. His Lordship spoke on the occasion for about thirty or forty minutes. His mind is not vigorous nor comprehensive; he is incapable of taking enlarged or profound views of any question, or of grappling with the arguments of an opponent; but there is generally something amusing in what he says. When a member of the other House of Parliament he often used to make long speeches in different parts of the counties of Aberdeen, Banff, and Elgin, which

were chiefly remarkable for the unbounded latitude of topic and illustration he allowed himself. Sometimes he had topics without illustrations; but more frequently, if I may be allowed the expression, illustrations without topics. He rambled about from one thing to another at an extraordinary rate: scarcely any two sentences had the remotest connection with each other; at one time you heard him expending his wit on some political opponent whom he imagined to be angling on some of the rivers in those counties; the next moment he was off at a tangent from all local matters, and had you assisting him to "shake the Speaker of the House of Commons into the chair;" then, again, he would leave his last sentence about the Speaker or his wig unfinished, in order that he might have you, without the loss of an instant, in the society of the gravediggers in Hamlet. You were beginning to wonder what would come next, when, before giving you time to form a conjecture on the subject, he, by a prompt annihilation of space, and in defiance of the lapse of two thousand years, dragged you back to ancient Greece or Rome, in order that he might introduce you to some of their most distinguished philosophers or heroes. You had hardly made your bow, and uttered a "How do you do, Sir," or "Gentlemen?" as the case might be, when off he

would fly with you again, overleaping the barriers of time and space, to the war in the Peninsula, in which he had taken a part, and from which he had, at the time I speak of, been only a few years returned. You had scarcely had time to take breath, when, with the rapidity of thought, back he flew with you to Elgin, for the purpose of lavishing compliments on its "bonnie lassies." In this way he would have gone on for an hour at a time, disdaining to be trammelled by any rules or method. These speeches were usually made at general elections; but they had no immediate bearing on the politics of the day. The fact is, he never could, by any exertion, confine himself strictly for a few minutes at a time to any particular subject. He often, at the period to which I allude, made long speeches without any apparent definite object in view when he commenced, beyond that of making a speech. It is said of a celebrated mathematician, that he wondered what people could see in the Iliad of Homer to admire, for it appeared to him to prove nothing,—his mind being so absorbed in mathematical demonstrations as to have no relish for any thing else. It certainly might have been said of Lord Fife's speeches at the time I refer to, with the strictest truth, that they proved nothing; they had neither head nor tail;

they were, as to reasoning, without beginning, middle, or end; still, as I before mentioned, there was always something amusing in what he said; in fact, the very variety of his matter—which, by the way, always showed extensive reading—could not fail to amuse: there were, too, often cleverness, and sometimes wit, in his detached observations.

He is a bad speaker; his manner is awkward; less graceful gesture is seldom to be seen; it is of that nondescript kind which defies description; suffice it to say, there is plenty of it; what it wants in quality is made up in quantity to those who will accept the latter as a substitute for the former. His voice is not good; it wants clearness and variety of tone; it is aggravated by a wretched enunciation. He speaks with some rapidity, but says less than a speaker who does not speak so fast would do in the same space of time, owing to the frequency with which he stammers, and the time he takes to correct himself. His style is of a piece with his elocution; it is unpolished and inaccurate.

Lord Fife, when in the House, always occupies the bench farthest back on the Ministerial side; there he sits as much in retirement, and seemingly as much wrapped up in his own thoughts, as if “the lone inhabitant of some desolate isle.” He never carries on any conversation with any Peer on the

adjoining benches; for, except on the occasion of a very important debate, when the members muster strong, he always has the bench on which he sits to himself. He is not frequent in his attendance on his parliamentary duties, even when in town; and when he does go to the House, he seldom remains long in it, unless a division be expected. When he quits the House, he walks home by himself, at his own leisure, hardly ever casting a look on any one he meets.

In person he is rather tall and handsome; his eye is quick, dark, and full of lustre; his features are small, but pleasing; his face inclines to the oval form; his complexion is dark, and his hair of a black colour. To see him walking in the streets, no one would suppose that he has not only entered his sixty-sixth year, but endured a good deal of hard service during the Peninsular war.

The Earl of FITZWILLIAM was for many years well-known to the public as Lord Milton, and as a member of the House of Commons, under that title. His politics have always been of a decidedly liberal complexion; and perhaps few men have been more consistent, or zealous, or straightforward, than the noble Lord, in his advocacy of them. The subject, however, which of all others has most engaged his attention, and in connection with which

he is best known, is that of the Corn Laws. When a member of the other House, he brought forward a motion annually for the repeal of those laws. Nor has his zeal in favour of such repeal abated in the slightest measure by his elevation to the Peerage. He loses no opportunity of bringing his peculiar notions on the subject before their Lordships: it is with him, like a one-pound paper currency with Mr. Thomas Attwood, a sort of monomania. Whatever be the question before the House, he usually contrives, by some means or other, to "hitch in" something in the shape of an attack on what he calls the Corn Law Monopoly; nor does he confine his exertions for the abolition of that monopoly within the walls of Parliament: he has pressed the printer into the service. He has written various pamphlets on the subject, which evince a thorough knowledge of the question, and which have not been without their effect in bringing about that opposition to any restrictions on the importation of foreign corn into our ports, which is now so general throughout the manufacturing districts of the country.

The noble Earl is a man of highly respectable talents: his matter is usually above mediocrity, but it never indicates an original or very vigorous mind. He thinks with much clearness, and generally ex-

presses himself with much precision: it is almost impossible to misconceive his meaning, or not to perceive the appropriateness of the arguments which he advances in favour of his views of any question. He has little, if any, imagination: he is chiefly a matter-of-fact man. He makes no effort at philosophical reasoning; he chooses the most obvious arguments, and expresses them in plain language. The most distinguishing quality of his mind is, perhaps, his great moral courage. Nothing will deter him from the expression of his sentiments. The popularity or unpopularity of his principles in the House, make no difference to him: he is equally fearless in their assertion, whether he have a willing audience or not. Whether what he says receive the applause or disapprobation of noble Lords, is a circumstance which never for a moment concerns him. The boldness and pertinacity with which he presses his Corn Law notions on the House, furnishes a striking instance of this. A more unpopular proposition than the abolition of the Corn Laws could not be made in their Lordships' House, unless, indeed, it were one, in accordance with the suggestions of the Destructives, for the extinction altogether of that branch of the Legislature. Even the Liberal Peers, with very few exceptions, are equally strenuous supporters of a Corn

Law protection, with the Tory side of the House. So decided are the opinions of noble Lords on this subject, that nineteen out of every twenty of them, regard the proposal of Earl Fitzwilliam to do away with the Corn Laws, as a species of downright robbery of their property. They make no distinction between the attempt to repeal those laws, and that of a footpad making a thrust at their pockets: if there be any difference, they think the attempt of the latter to be the least reprehensible of the two, inasmuch as he runs the risk of receiving a broken head in the effort, or, perchance, a voyage to the antipodes; while the former goes with perfect impunity, because quite legally, to work. The noble Earl is well aware that such is the light in which noble Lords regard his strenuous exertions to put an end to the Corn Laws; but the circumstance does not cause him a moment's uneasiness; he heeds not their dislike or their displeasure. He is equally fearless in the assertion of other extremely unpopular opinions. An instance occurred in the course of last Session: he had, in vindicating the rights of the Dissenters to the same privileges as the members of the Church, applied the term "sect" to the Church, as Lord Hatherton had done before him, when the following animated altercation

between him and the Archbishop of Canterbury occurred:—

The Earl of Wicklow.—My Lords, I rise to order. The noble Earl has not been even alluded to by the most reverend Prelate. The person alluded to was the noble Baron who spoke from the back benches. If that noble Lord has any observations to make, he has a right to speak; but the noble Earl has no right, now, to rise in his place, in order to show how he understands his “Latin Grammar” and his “Latin Dictionary.” The noble Earl was entirely out of order in rising; but, now, most grossly so, in persevering to maintain his ground.

Lord Hatherton.—I beg to say, in explanation, that it is true I used the term “sect;” at the same time, I must say that I did not use it in the sense applied to it by the most reverend Prelate, but as it has been before used, with reference to the meeting in question.

Earl Fitzwilliam.—I will now explain what I meant by a “sect,”—that is, with the permission of the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Wicklow), I will do so. What I say is, that the Church of England is as much a “sect” as those classes of Dissenters from the Church which I enumerated. The Established Church, it is true, is the predomi-

nant sect; and I confess that I am surprised that the most reverend Prelate should have felt himself called upon to express any regret at such a designation of a Church to which he belongs.

The Archbishop of Canterbury.—I rise with reluctance to take a part in the present debate, contrary to my original intention: but I cannot sit in silence in your Lordships' House, and hear a noble Lord, formerly filling a most responsible situation under the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, use language which I believe has never before been heard in this House. The noble Lord has called the Protestant Church of Ireland "a sect." Such language, my Lords, I repeat, has never, I believe, been heard before within this House; language, the noble Baron must give me leave to say, in itself as unconstitutional as it is in its character disrespectful to your Lordships. — (Cries of "No, no!")

Earl Fitzwilliam.—I rise to order. I trust the most reverend Prelate will allow me to send him back to his Latin Grammar and Dictionary. The most reverend Prelate does not seem to understand what is "a sect." What is a sect? Why, the Church of England is itself a sect. The Church of England is just as much a sect as the Romish Church, or the Baptist, the Presbyterian, or the

Unitarian—(cries of “No, no!”)—Give me leave to tell that most reverend Prelate—learned and most reverend as he may be—that if—(cries of “Spoke, spoke!”)—I have a right to explain, and I will! After one or two explanatory remarks he then sat down.

The noble Earl is not an old man: he is only in his fiftieth year. He is tall, and spare in his personal appearance, which is not improved by his style of dress. His features have a serious cast. His face, like his person generally, is rather thin. He is of a swarthy complexion: it is perhaps as much so as that of any noble Lord, with a very few exceptions, in the House. His appearance has somewhat of singularity, from the circumstance of his invariably having his dark-brown hair carefully combed, instead of being adjusted on one side, down his forehead. He has a fine deep-toned voice, which is evidently capable of being modulated with much effect, though his Lordship seems to have no such management over it as to produce agreeable intonations. I have said that his style is plain: he aims, however, at blending rounded periods with this simplicity, and hence his sentences partake much of an unpleasant monotony. His tones and manner resemble, in no slight degree, a manner very common among evangelical preachers.

And his appearance altogether tends to produce the association of the pulpit with his parliamentary speeches. Usually he is sparing in his gesture, but when he speaks under the influence of excited feelings, he is liberal of it even to redundance.

CHAPTER XIV.

LIBERAL PARTY—BARONS.

LORD BROUGHAM—LORD PLUNKETT—LORD DEN-
 MAN—LORD COTTENHAM—LORD LANGDALE—
 LORD HATHERTON—LORD TEYNHAM.

To those who have been in the House any time, and paid ordinary attention to what is passing around them, it is no difficult matter to anticipate the time or occasion on which Lord BROUGHAM will rise to address their Lordships. If any pointed allusion be made to him by any Peer on the opposite side, and he have not already addressed the House, you may rest assured the noble and learned Lord will get up the moment the Peer who is speaking has resumed his seat ; for though no man is more frequent or fierce in his attacks on others than his Lordship, he is one of the most sensitive persons I ever knew to the attacks made on himself, and he is perfectly miserable until he has returned the blow with tenfold force on his hapless adversary. On

other occasions you may tell with unerring certainty when Lord Brougham is about to speak. When anxious to address their Lordships himself, he gives the most manifest signs of impatience for the conclusion of the speech which some other noble Lord is delivering at the time. When, to use a homely but expressive term, you see him fidgetty, while some Peer on the opposite side is speaking, no matter whether or not any allusion has been made to him,—the odds are two to one that he rises when the other sits down. If you see him sitting with one leg over the other, and his face to the bar instead of to the Woolsack,—the presumption increases one hundred per cent. that he is the next person to address their Lordships ; but if, in addition to these symptoms of his mind labouring with some tumultuous emotions of which he is anxious to rid himself, you see his head drooping as if his face were half buried in his breast, and observe him give a hasty scratch at the back of his head, accompanied with two or three twitches of his nose ; if, on any occasion, you observe all this, while an Opposition Peer is speaking—and you will not observe it on any other—you may rely on his Lordship's succeeding the present speaker with as much confidence as you repose in the rising of to-morrow's sun.

When Lord Brougham rises to speak, the

stranger is so forcibly struck with his singular personal appearance, as to be altogether inattentive to the first few sentences of his speech. His lofty forehead—his dark complexion—his prominent nose—the piercing glare of his rolling eye—the scowl of his brow—the harshness of his features generally—the uproarious condition of his dark grey hair, and his attenuated appearance altogether—cannot fail in the first instance to attract the eye and arrest the attention, to the exclusion of any thought about what he is saying. This is to a certain extent the case, whatever be the mood of mind in which he rises. But when he gets up to repel a personal attack, or under feelings of strong party excitement—and few men feel more strongly on party questions—there is an abruptness and energy in his manner, which contrast so strongly with the conduct of other Peers, that the stranger feels for a few moments quite confounded.

When Lord Brougham rises to make a long speech on any important question, without having been called up in consequence of allusions made to himself, or under the influence of unusually strong party feelings, he invariably commences in a comparatively low and subdued tone. On such occasions he lays down general principles, the immediate bearing of which on the question before their Lordships it is difficult to perceive. As, however,

he proceeds, you gradually begin to see the object which the noble Lord is aiming at, and also to perceive the forcible application of the principles he has laid down to that object. As he begins to apply these principles to the question before the House, their singularly forcible bearing on the view of the question which he takes flashes so vividly on your mind, that you are no less surprised at your own obtuseness in not having before perceived it, than you are struck with the splendid talents of the man who has thus, with the greatest manifest ease to himself, been pressing into his service the universally admitted dictates of morality—the most obvious maxims of a sound philosophy—and the great truths on which the Constitution of the country is based. All his preliminary considerations and general principles are, as it were, at last concentrated into a focus, and brought to bear on the question before the House with a perfectly overwhelming force. And when he has thus reached the marrow of his subject, you see a visible difference in his manner of speaking; his energy and animation increase; he speaks with greater rapidity, and his action becomes much more violent.

It is only on a great political question, and one on which he feels very strongly, that Lord Brougham is to be heard to any advantage. Those who have

heard him for the first time on such a subject as the repeal of the newspaper duties,—or on a proposed reform in the administration of the law, &c.,—go away wondering what people see in him to admire. On such occasions he reasons well, displays extensive information, considerable thinking powers, and an eloquent and energetic style; but they can see nothing either in his matter or in his manner to entitle him to the reputation of the most effective speaker of the age. It is otherwise when he rises to repel a personal attack, or to speak on any question of party politics. On such occasions you see in his very countenance the consciousness of superior powers. His knit brow, his piercing eyes, the air of supreme scorn towards those who differ from him, which his whole aspect exhibits,—concur with the sentiments to which he gives expression to show you that his whole soul is thrown into his speech. It is then, and only then, that you witness any real display of his amazing powers. He then stands forth an intellectual gladiator, fighting not with one or two opponents only, but with every Peer of any weight who has taken a different view of the subject from himself. No sooner has he, by the liberality and energy of his blows, disabled one opponent, and left him sprawling on the ground, than he deals them out as thickly and as heavily to

another; and so on until he has vanquished every opponent who has had the temerity to attempt to obstruct his advance to the point to which he was directing his steps. He is not content with pushing aside those who oppose his progress: he lays one and all of them prostrate at his feet, and tramples them in the dust. He gives no quarter to an antagonist. His soul seems to exult in the occupation of butchering his adversaries outright. He is so intent on the object, that he is quite indifferent as to the means; or rather he gives a preference to the most barbarous modes of intellectual warfare. It is not enough that he vanquish his opponent; it must be done in the most cruel and savage manner. His attacks are always of the fiercest kind. All refinement of feeling, and all the conventional proprieties of language, are utterly disregarded. He disdains to cut up his subjects scientifically or anatomically. For the time being he battles away right and left, and feels as keenly towards his opponent as if it were a personal, not a political or party quarrel, in which he is engaged. His whole heart is set on what a certain class of persons call "punishing" his adversary. This he thinks can only be effectually done by doing it coarsely. He is consequently often called to order for violating the rules of the House; but this only aggravates the evil it was

intended to remedy. The more he is interrupted in his attacks on an opponent, the more furious in his manner and the less measured in his language does he become. He is not only not to be put down, however general and decided the feeling of the House may be against the course he is pursuing, but he will not be diverted from his resolution of inflicting the full measure of intended severity on his victim by any means which he chooses to adopt. So long as he is interrupted only by particular Peers, he confines his furious attack to the opponent against whom he was directing his withering sarcasms, and on whom he was heaping his ridicule, at the time of the interruption,—except during the few moments he may step out of his way to apply the lash to those who have called him to order; but when the cry of “Order” has become general, and the confusion so great as to drown his voice, he suddenly pauses until the confusion has subsided, and then pours forth the overflowing phials of his wrath on the Opposition generally. The most striking instance I have witnessed of this occurred last session, in the course of the debates on the Municipal Corporation Bill. On that occasion, because some slight interruption was offered to him, he became violent in an extraordinary degree, even for himself, and told their Lordships in terms which did not admit of two constructions, that they were a mob.

He can, however, be, and often is, refined in his sarcasms, when speaking on topics on which he does not feel strongly. On such occasions I have often seen him display a rich vein of quiet humour, which could not fail to tell with effect on an audience like the House of Lords, and which often produces general laughter. He himself, however, is hardly ever seen to indulge in a smile.

In Lord Brougham's angrier moods there is something terrible even in his looks and manner. His eye, as already mentioned, flashes with indignation, his lip curls, his brow has a lowering aspect, and the tones of his voice and the violence of his gesture, have something in them which, altogether irrespective of what he says, cannot fail to make an adversary quail before him. And this indignation is not artificial or assumed, like the zeal an advocate manifests for his client, and the indignation with which he denounces the conduct of the opposite party. In Lord Brougham, as already mentioned, it is as real as it is violent. Like all violent feelings, however, it is only of transitory duration. The moment he has resumed his seat, often, indeed, as soon as he has given utterance to the last indignant expression, it passes away, and is no more thought of. In fact his dislikes are too suddenly conceived, as well as too violent, to be, in the nature of things, lasting.

When the noble Lord rises to speak on a party question, it is impossible to guess from any one sentence what will follow. He makes every thing he says bear either directly or indirectly on the positions he seeks to establish; but he is so capricious in his choice of topics, and in his illustrations of those topics, that he lugs in matter which no other man would ever dream of in speaking on the subject before the House. The Opposition Peers are consequently in the constant apprehension, individually, of being pounced upon by his Lordship for something they have either said in the course of the current discussion, or on some former occasion.

One very remarkable feature in his speeches is, the amazing extent of information they evince. Often in a speech of two or three hours' duration have I seen him sweep round the almost entire circle of knowledge, extracting arguments and illustrations from every branch of science and every department of polite literature. He is a living Encyclopædia. The ease and felicity with which he makes his varied knowledge subservient to his purpose, is as surprising as the extent of the knowledge itself. His memory is most tenacious; it never fails him, and his readiness at speaking enables him to turn every thing he has read to account. It is clear to

every one who hears him that he does not introduce the extensive knowledge he possesses for the sake of display: it comes too natural, and is always made to bear too visibly on the object he has in view, for that.

He is an eloquent speaker: but his eloquence has a character of its own. I know of nothing in ancient or modern oratory which can be said to resemble it. His sentences are usually of great length. It is nothing uncommon to see in his speeches, sentences which take more than a minute in the delivery. His style is consequently involved: but independently of the tendency of sentences of such extreme length to become involved, you will often see in one of them parenthesis within parenthesis. These sentences are, however, so constructed, that one never fails to perceive his meaning. You are struck with his amazing command of language—the more so, perhaps, from the original character of his diction, and the manifest ease with which he imparts that character to it. It is not fine or smooth: it is rough and rugged, and yet, generally speaking, it is perfectly correct of its kind. It resembles the Johnsonian more than the Addisonian, and yet it is in many respects unlike the former. There is no appearance of effort about it: it is not pompous or affected in him, though no man could imitate

it without a great effort, and, even then, but with indifferent success. It partakes much of the essential character of his mind. Like himself it is impetuous. It is like a rushing torrent, hurrying you along without giving you time even to attempt to resist its power. Nothing can obstruct its course. Lord Brougham never attempts to seduce you into his views of a question, nor to win you over to his opinions: he drags you over by force. You are not pleased with his principles, or the measures he advocates; you adopt the one and you concur in the other, because you cannot help it; nor do you feel the slightest affection for the speaker. You know nothing of the love for your new views, or of the attachment to him who has proselytised you, which usually characterise young converts. You feel as if he had, without any right on his part, attacked your opinions, or the measures you supported, and forced you into a position in which you can find no comfort. Lord Brougham, in all his attacks, goes straight forward to the citadel at once, which he assails in the true battering-ram style. The outposts never give him a thought, further than to effect an entrance for himself; he would disdain to waste his time or resources on these, knowing that other less bold and adventurous militants may be safely entrusted with the task of demolishing them.

Lord Brougham is a man of most gigantic mind. He has no equal in this respect in the present day. He can master with the greatest ease, and in an incredibly short time, the most difficult and intricate subjects. He sees a question, as if by a kind of intuition, in all its bearings, the moment it is presented to him. Nothing he ever does, whether it be speaking or writing, seems to cost him an effort. To grapple with vast and complicated questions, instead of being a task, seems a sort of luxury to him. On no other principle is his amazing extent of information to be accounted for.

His industry is untiring. His mind is ever active: it is like the troubled sea, it cannot rest. The moment he has quitted one subject he fixes his mind on another. One plan or project succeeds another as certainly and immediately as day succeeds night. Sometimes he is engaged at the same moment in several schemes, as different, it may be, as it were possible to conceive. Activity appears to be one of the necessities of his nature. A state of mental rest would be to him synonymous with extreme misery. Shut him up in a place by himself, denying him the use of books, and pen, ink, and paper, and you inflict on him the greatest punishment to which a human being could be subjected. Martyrdom itself, in any form you please,

could not have such horrors to his mind. Mental exhaustion is a feeling which he can seldom, if at all experience. I have known him give the closest and most careful attention to important cases in the Court of Chancery, from ten till four o'clock, and at five take his seat on the Woolsack in the House of Lords, where he would narrowly watch all the proceedings until ten or eleven o'clock, and then get up and make a speech of two hours' duration, replying with singular ability, as he proceeded, to every thing of weight which had been urged on the opposite side in the course of the evening. On the following morning, by ten o'clock, he would be again in the Court of Chancery, as fresh and vigorous, both in mind and body, as on the preceding day.

Lord Brougham's great defect as a public man is his want of discretion. He is quite the creature of impulse: he always speaks on the spur of the moment, and, in the great majority of cases, under the influence of strongly excited feelings. The consequence is, that he often gives utterance to things to which, in his cooler and more deliberative moments, he would not on any consideration give expression. And yet, though painful experience has taught him the inconvenience to himself personally, as well as the injury to the cause with which he has identified himself, of speaking under the

influence of a heated mind, he is still as liable to the commission of the same error as ever. Indeed, I question whether he has not committed himself more frequently in this way of late, than ever he did at any former period of his life. No doubt his character for consistency has, by this means, suffered to an extent to which it certainly ought not to suffer ; for though his words or speeches are often most unfortunately at variance with each other, it will be found that his actions have, in the main, been in accordance with the great principles which he espoused in early life.

He is a man of very hot and hasty temper. The least thing irritates him. I am not sure if, all circumstances considered, this infirmity of temper ought to be matter of regret to the public, whatever it may be to himself. It is certain that the most splendid of his oratorical efforts, in both Houses of Parliament, have been made when under the dominion of the most angry feelings. His presence of mind never, in such cases, forsakes him, while it gives him an acuteness of perception—however strange it may seem—and inspires him with a boldness and fervour of manner, which he never evinces when speaking in a more tranquil mood. I do not recollect to have ever seen him in what is called a greater passion, than on the evening, in the Session

of 1834, when his Local Courts Jurisdiction Bill was thrown out. He knew when he entered the House, from the strong muster of Peers on the Opposition side, that its rejection was inevitable, though he had not before anticipated such a result. Before rising to reply, he retired from the Wool-sack for about ten minutes into one of the ante-rooms, to take some refreshment. His return was waited with a breathless silence. The quick step with which he re-entered the House, as well as the indignant piercing glances he darted along the Opposition benches, before he opened his mouth, indicated the turbulent passions which agitated his bosom. There was a universal impression that he was about to hurl his denunciations, with unusual force and fury, at the devoted heads of those who had taken the most active part in opposing the measure. The event proved the impression was not unfounded. So great was the passion into which he had worked himself, that before he had got through a third of his speech, he was literally foaming at the mouth. His castigation of Lord Wynford, who that evening headed the Opposition, was terrible. Every sentence he uttered seemed like a thunderbolt, hurled at the heads of those who opposed the Bill. Lord Wynford bore his share with the most exemplary fortitude for a time ;

but at length his powers of patient endurance became exhausted, and, literally writhing under the merciless severity of the Lord Chancellor, he rose from his seat, difficult as it was for him to stand,* and called aloud with great warmth of feeling, for the enforcement of the fifteenth standing order † of the House. And yet, notwithstanding the violently excited feelings under which Lord Brougham spoke on this occasion, I do not, as already stated, recollect to have witnessed a more splendid display of his surprising powers of mind.

It is in reply that the noble Lord appears to greatest advantage. In making a set speech, be

* Lord Wynford has, as elsewhere mentioned, for some years laboured under bodily indisposition, which makes it difficult for him to stand on his feet.

† This standing order is as follows:—“To prevent misunderstandings, and for avoiding offensive speeches, when matters are debating either in the House or at Committees, it is for honour’s sake thought fit and so ordered, that all personal, sharp, or taxing speeches be forborne; and whosoever answereth another man’s speech, shall apply his answer to the matter without wrong to the person; and as nothing offensive is to be spoken, so nothing is to be ill taken, if the party that speaks it shall presently make a fair exposition or clear denial of the words that might bear any ill construction; and if any offence of that kind be given, as the House itself will be very sensible thereof, so it will sharply censure the offenders, and give the party offended a fit reparation and full satisfaction.

the subject what it may, he is comparatively nothing. It is opposition or collision alone that can call his powers of mind into full action. His quickness in detecting the weak points of an adversary, is then as surprising as is the skill with which he unravels the most ingeniously spun webs of sophistry. It matters not how often he be interrupted; that, as I have before stated, never discomposes him in the slightest degree. If such interruptions be in the shape of any remark on what he is saying, his readiness and felicity in retorting, never fail to astonish all who hear him. And he retorts with equal effect on all of them, should five or six, or more, noble Lords on the opposite side, interrupt him consecutively by one remark immediately following another.

If a noble Lord on the opposite benches cry "Hear, hear," he will sometimes pause, and, looking the Peer in the face, exclaim in derision, "I have very good ears—I hear what I am saying perfectly well! I only wish the noble friends of the noble Lord on the opposite benches may have their ears equally open, and that hearing, they may understand." If any noble Lord cry "No, no," or otherwise dispute his statements or positions, he will that moment quit the train of thought he was pursuing, to answer the negative by which he was inter-

rupted. He will exclaim, " But I say ' Aye, aye, ' " and then he will launch out into a series of proofs to convince the noble Lord that he was wrong and himself right. He will possibly occupy a minute in demolishing the negative of the Peer interrupting him, and then, to the great surprise of all present, will fall as easily and naturally into the train of thought he was pursuing at the time of the interruption, as if nothing had occurred. The most trifling circumstance leads him into digressions. If he see, or fancy he sees, a smile playing on the face of a political opponent, he will suddenly pause in the midst of his most eloquent passages, and launch his bold and bitter invectives at his head for his alleged want of manners; or it may be he will cover him with his ironical praise, which is quite as withering as his fiercest invective.

I have spoken of the restlessness of his mind: it is a part of this restlessness to delight in collision. It would not be enough for him that his great powers were kept in constant exercise by co-operation with other persons; it is necessary to his enjoyment of existence that he come into collision with the minds of others. He ought never to be—and, were he to consult his own individual gratification, he never would be—on the side of the strongest

party: opposition is the sphere in which Nature intended him always to move, and the stronger and more powerful the party opposed to him, the better for his own gratification; the more formidable the power with which he conflicts the more strikingly does he display his transcendant talents, and the greater is his enjoyment of life. Other minds find happiness in repose; his only in the excitement and turmoil of battle. He bitterly regrets his having been transplanted to the Lords: in the Commons he found comfort in the repeated scenes of turbulence and uproar which the floor of that house exhibits; the gravity, and dignity, and quiet of the Upper House are the never-failing source of misery to him.

You see a constant expression of restlessness, discontent, and pugnacity in his countenance during the more quiet proceedings of the House. You need not the aid of a phrenological examination of his cranium to convince you that the organ of combativeness is most prominently developed; one glance of his face will satisfy you on that point. Had destiny made him one of the lower orders of Irishmen, and given him birth in the neighbourhood of Donnybrook, he would have acquired great distinction in the pugilistic exhibitions of its fair; he

would always have been giving and receiving broken heads and broken bones.

His moral courage is great; nothing can daunt him. In the House of Commons, in its unreformed days, he was as obnoxious as could be, to four-fifths of the members. Did this dishearten him? Not in the least. He spoke as boldly, and fought as resolutely, as if four-fifths had been with him.

It is the same in the Lords. He knows he is hated by the Opposition, and even by several Peers on his own side of politics, with an intensity which even Cobbett himself never surpassed in his enmities, bitter as they were. He knows that every thing he utters is thoroughly disliked, often as much because of the quarter whence it comes, as on its own account; yet he is not in the least disheartened. He sets to work as cordially and boldly as if he were the idol of their Lordships, and as if every thing which fell from him were music to their ears, and were greeted with the most cordial cheers.

He is proud and overbearing: his whole demeanour shows how conscious he is of his own surprising powers. He looks down on the other Peers in the House as if they were of an inferior order of creation. The supercilious airs he often assumes, and the latitude of speech in which he frequently

indulges, would not be tolerated in the private intercourse of life. He generally looks for a homage approaching to servility from those with whom he comes in contact. It is the little respect which is shown him by his fellow Peers, that is the great secret of the furious attacks he so frequently makes on the House of Lords.

When Lord Chancellor, nothing could exceed his conceptions of his own importance. That the office he held is a most important office, and that from the great influence which his commanding talents enabled him to exert on the public mind, he was, and is, a person of great importance,—is not to be doubted; but still his estimate of his own consequence during the time he held the Great Seal, was vastly exaggerated. He seemed to think that he held in his hand the destinies of the world, and that he was a sort of deity; while all around him were nothing better than the ordinary elements of mortality. The contemptuous and snappish manner in which he spoke to deputations of the Commons who had bills to present to the House of Lords, was often almost beyond endurance. On one such occasion, and only one, did I ever see him relax in the sternness and rigidity of his features. It was when Mr. O'Connell, in the Session of 1834, brought up some bill relating to Ireland from the

other House. It happened three or four days after Lord Brougham had called—in his place in the House of Lords—Mr. O’Connell a great national mendicant, and contrasted him with Dante and other distinguished geniuses, whose independence of spirit was such that they would have submitted to the humblest occupations in life rather than be dependent on the bounty of others. On this occasion, without saying a word, he took the bill at the bar of the House from Mr. O’Connell, giving a smile which he obviously could not restrain, as he received it. No doubt the circumstance of coming so soon in contact with the Member for Dublin, after he had spoken of him in the above derogatory terms, was the cause of the smile. The first time they met together after this—and I am not sure that they have met again since—was in the spring of 1835, at a public dinner in the London Tavern. There was only one gentleman between them at dinner that evening. Lord Brougham made advances towards a reconciliation by proposing to drink “Adam’s wine,” (water) as he called it, with Mr. O’Connell. They drank to each other, Lord Brougham saying to Mr. O’Connell, as he put the glass of water to his lips, “We have not drunk wine together since we sat *tête-à-tête* at a

public dinner in 1823*." Mr. O'Connell said his Lordship was right as to the main fact, but that the dinner took place in 1822, not 1823. I mention this trifling circumstance of these two individuals drinking to each other on this occasion, as Lord Brougham, in an hour or so afterwards, pronounced one of the highest encomiums both on the talents and virtues of Mr. O'Connell which ever one man pronounced on another.

He never studies his speeches beforehand. This is evident from the allusions which he makes to every thing of importance which transpires in the House respecting the question before it. These allusions are not slight or few; but very often form the staple of his speeches. Yet, though an extempore speaker, he never betrays the least difficulty, or shows the slightest symptoms of being at a loss, as to how he should proceed. His mind is so fertile; his resources in argument, illustration, sarcasm, denunciation, invective, abuse, are so ample, that the only difficulty he feels is, to select the best matter which presents itself, and to know when he ought to stop. The readiness and fertility of his mind often lead him to overlay the side of the question which he espouses, with arguments and illustrations.

* His Lordship mentioned the occasion on which the dinner took place, but I have forgotten it.

He is never at a loss for words; they flow on him as copiously as do his ideas; they seem to come, like Shakspeare's spirits, from the vasty deep,—without being called.

But though the noble Lord does not prepare his speeches beforehand, he does on some great and particular occasions carefully study some parts of them. In such a case, his taste is remarkably fastidious. It is almost impossible for him to please himself with any thing he does. A singular instance of this was afforded in his speech on the conclusion of Queen Caroline's trial. The peroration of that speech, which is undoubtedly one of the most splendid specimens of eloquence which modern times can produce, was written and re-written no fewer than fourteen times*.

* The following is the peroration of the speech referred to:—“Such, my Lords, is the case now before you, and such is the evidence by which it is attempted to be upheld. It is evidence inadequate to prove any proposition—impotent, to deprive the lowest subject of any civil right—ridiculous, to establish the least offence—scandalous, to support a charge of the highest nature—monstrous, to ruin the honour of the Queen of England. What shall I say of it, then, as evidence to support a judicial act of the Legislature, an *ex post facto* law? My Lords, I call upon you to pause. You stand on the brink of a precipice: if your judgment shall go out against your Queen, it will be the only act that ever went out without effecting its purpose: it will return to you—it will recoil on

His voice possesses great flexibility. In its more usual tones there is something approaching to harshness; but in all his important speeches he varies it to such an extent as to touch on almost every conceivable key. In its lower tones it is soft and sweet, and often, when pitched on a higher key, it has much of music in its intonations. Few men have an equal command over their voice. He raises and lowers it at pleasure. In his more indignant moods it has uncommon power and compass, and admirably suits the bold, impetuous character of his manner and eloquence.

His gesture is as varied as his voice. On ordinary subjects he is calm and gentle in his manner;

your own heads. Save the country—my Lords, save yourselves. Rescue the country—save the people, of whom you are the ornaments; but severed from whom, you can no more live, than can the blossom that is severed from the root and tree on which it grows. Save the country, therefore, that you may continue to adorn it—save the crown, which is threatened with irreparable injury—save the aristocracy, which is surrounded with danger—save the altar, which is no longer safe when its kindred throne is shaken. You see, that when the Church and the throne would allow of no Church solemnity on behalf of the Queen, the heartfelt prayers of the people rose to Heaven for her protection. I pray Heaven for her, and I here pour forth my fervent supplications at the Throne of Mercy, that mercies may descend on the people of this country, more than their rulers have deserved, and that your hearts may be turned to justice.”

but when he becomes excited—on which occasions, as before mentioned, he throws his whole soul into his speeches—his action becomes violent in no ordinary degree. His arms are put into such requisition that it were very unsafe for any noble Lord to be, as the phrase is, within arm's-length of him. He has no favourite system or fashion—if either term be a correct one—of gesture. It is as varied as are the forms into which the human body can be put, or the position which one's arms can be made to assume. In this respect he is a second Proteus. His gesture has no grace ; it is often as awkward as can well be imagined, and in any other man would appear ridiculous.

I have said that his speeches never cost him a mental effort ; neither does the delivery seem to require any physical exertion. I never saw him, even after his longest and most energetically delivered speeches, exhibiting symptoms of exhaustion : I have seen him sit down, after the delivery of speeches which occupied the attention of the House for three or four hours, during which time he may be said to have been speaking in a voice of thunder, and with a corresponding violence of action, and yet appear as fresh and vigorous in body as well as in mind, as when he rose to address their Lordships.

A few years since, when a member of the other House, he spoke for nearly seven hours, without intermission, on the subject of a reform in our courts of law, and yet so little appearance of fatigue was there in his manner, that any one who had entered the House ten or fifteen minutes before he resumed his seat, might have inferred he had only just commenced. Speaking seems, in a physical as well as mental sense, to be a sort of pastime to him ; it certainly is not a task. Tailors are said to rest themselves when they run ; his Lordship appears to refresh his body as well as his mind when hurling his anathemas at the heads of noble Lords.

With the single exception of the Duke of Cumberland, I do not know any noble Lord who is more regular in his attendance in the House. You hardly ever miss him from his seat. He sits there, whatever be the subject before their Lordships, in the momentary expectation that something may occur to give him an opportunity of speaking. He is evidently miserable in his seat, and when an occasion does not offer itself for his addressing their Lordships, he very often contrives to find one for himself. His ingenuity in this way has often struck me as remarkable. I have seen him time after time seize on the most trifling observation imaginable,

which had fallen from some noble lord, and make it a peg on which to hang a speech of forty or fifty minutes' duration.

Of Lord Brougham's literary character I have said nothing: it is not necessary I should. His attainments in literature and science, and the zeal with which he still cultivates both, are too well known to require any particular reference to them. As a writer in periodicals, he is perhaps one of the most voluminous of the present day. His contributions to the *Edinburgh Review* alone would, were they collected, make ten or twelve ordinary sized volumes, and his pen is still constantly at work on one or more periodicals. In addition to the articles he continues to furnish to the *Edinburgh*, he is understood to be a regular contributor to the *British and Foreign Review*. The subjects on which he employs his pen are infinitely varied from the higher branches of science down to the most humble departments of politics.

Though now in his fifty-seventh year, Lord Brougham, until lately, looked as healthy and as strong in constitution as ever. In the Session of 1834, I heard him say he never was in better health or spirits in his life, than he then was*.

* Latterly Lord Brougham has been unwell, but he is now understood to be quite recovered.

His intellectual faculties are also as vigorous and his mind is as active as ever; so that there is every reason to believe he will continue for years to come to be regarded, taken all in all,—as he undoubtedly is at present,—as the greatest man of the age.

LORD PLUNKETT'S personal appearance, when he rises to address the House, is much against him; it but ill prepares the stranger for the continued display of talent, and occasional display of eloquence, he is about to witness. He is about the middle height, and rather stoutly made; his head and neck lean a little to the right side; his features are haggard and strongly marked, evidently caused in a great measure by the weight of years—seventy-two—which hangs on his head. His complexion is pale and wan. His eyes have a sunken appearance, owing to the protuberance of his eye-brows. His forehead is contracted, and has by no means an intellectual expression. You would rather take it for granted that he was a plain blunt man, possessed, it may be, of much good sense, but certainly not a person of brilliant parts. Nor is there any thing in the character of the exordium of his speech to prepossess you in favour of his qualifications as a public speaker. He has not, however, proceeded far before he convinces you that your first conclusion was erroneous: your opinion will also undergo a partial

change before he resume his seat, as to the second point. No one ever heard him deliver twenty sentences without being struck with his great intellectual superiority. A very few introductory words serve his turn. With these—usually consisting of an expression of regret that he must trespass on the attention of noble Lords, and assuring them he will be as brief as a sense of duty will permit—with these few words, in the form of a preface, he plunges at once into the marrow of his subject. You see from that moment the variety and fulness of his mental resources. If other noble Lords of note have spoken before him on the other side, he boldly grapples at once with the most formidable arguments which they have advanced. If no opponent of weight and merit has preceded him, he proceeds to urge the most masterly arguments in favour of his own view of the question which the question admits of. It is difficult to say in which respect he is most happy; but no one can fail to admire the ingenuity and ability he evinces in both cases. Mere minor matters never for a moment occupy his attention. These he always overlooks as entirely as if they did not exist. Either a commonplace argument never suggests itself to his mind on a great question, or if it does, he disdains to employ it. In replying to an opponent, he acts on the same principle: every

thing of inferior importance, or destitute of ability, which may have been advanced on the other side, he passes over without deigning to give even the least indication that his ears were cognisant of it. His reasoning is always characterised by originality. Every other nobleman of note may have spoken on the same side of the question, and you may have been perfectly satisfied in your own minds that they have entirely exhausted the subject; you expect, therefore, as a matter of course, that all that Lord Plunkett can do is to put some of the arguments he employs in a clearer light. He soon convinces you of your error. He strikes out, to your great surprise—and to your mortification that you should have not perceived what now appears to you in so clear a light—an entirely new course of argument, which, whether legitimate or not, is managed with so much ingenuity and tact that you find yourself unable to refute it. If fair arguments are within his reach, he presses them into his service, to the exclusion of sophistry; if not, no matter; he will dress up a series of fallacies with so much skill that they are found to answer his purpose almost, if not altogether, equally well. He is a most dexterous debater; he is fully master of all the tricks of the profession—that of the law—to which he belongs. I know of no man who can

more easily, or more effectually, either place an adversary between the horns of a dilemma, or extricate himself, at least to appearance, from any similar difficulty in which he is placed by another party. In the course of his lengthened public life he has on many occasions manifestly compromised his consistency of character. With this inconsistency he is often charged by his opponents; let them only, however, descend to particular cases, let them only specify the respects in which he is inconsistent, and he will vindicate himself with so much ingenuity, that, though you may still retain the impression of his being an inconsistent man, you cannot detect a single flaw in the course of argument—sophistry if you will—by which he labours to disprove the charge. I have seen noble Lords on the opposite side read passages of his speeches, delivered at different times, on the same subject; and certainly darkness and light are not more opposite in their nature than were the sentiments expressed in some of these speeches. You consequently conclude it were folly in him to make an attempt to vindicate or explain away his conduct. He thinks differently, and so will you before he resume his seat. A striking instance of this occurred last Session on the Church of Ireland Appropriation question. It was proved by a noble Lord on the opposite side of the

House—the Earl of Wicklow, if I remember rightly—by copious extracts from his speeches at the different periods, the accuracy of which speeches he could not and did not question; it was proved by these extracts from his speeches that, in 1825, his opinions on the propriety of appropriating the Church property to other than ecclesiastical purposes were the very antipodes of those he avowed in 1835. Lord Plunkett rose to meet the charge of inconsistency, if not something worse, implied in these conflicting opinions, and vindicated himself with so much ability that before he sat down he appeared before you a pattern of the most perfect consistency.

Lord Plunkett's speeches are remarkable for the quantity of matter they contain; in almost every sentence you have an idea or argument. His style is not polished, at least it is not generally so, though in some of his most brilliant effusions it is equally characterised by its accuracy and eloquence; usually it is terse and nervous, rather than polished; this partly arises from a too sparing use of words. He does not indulge in personalities as regards individuals; but there is often much asperity in his manner towards his opponents as a body. You would suppose when you hear him speaking in reply—and I suspect the suspicion would not be

altogether groundless—that he is labouring under an infirmity of temper.

As a mere speaker he does not rank high; his voice is sufficiently powerful, but its tones are unmusical and usually monotonous. He sometimes stutters, not seemingly for the want of proper words—for he seems to have the words he intends employing very clearly in his mind's eye—but from some inherent difficulty in getting his organs of speech to perform their functions with that ease and facility which he could desire. In his gesticulation there is nothing worthy of remark; it chiefly consists in a slow gentle raising of his right arm, and occasionally moving his head from one part of his own side of the House to the other. But though there is but little energy in his gesture, there is often a great deal, mingled with much earnestness of manner, in his mode of speaking. Perhaps there is no member of either House who, possessing so little of the graces of elocution, or the attractions of good speaking, is listened to with so much attention; every eye is turned to him, and every ear is open, when he is addressing the House. It is not any part of my plan to attempt to analyse the principles of action in those whose mental and personal portraitures I have endeavoured to take—that were a dangerous as well as an arduous task;—I have mentioned,

however, the qualities of mind which one would infer from the expression of the countenances of several of those of whom I have spoken. Lord Plunkett's features furnish no indication of generosity or benevolence.

Lord DENMAN, as is generally known, presided in the House from the return of the Melbourne Ministry to office, to the meeting of the present Session, except during the few days he was necessarily absent in July, in the discharge of his duties as a Criminal Judge at the county assizes. He has, however, taken scarcely any part in the proceedings of the House since his elevation to the Peerage. I do not believe he has uttered anything above two or three times, and even then his addresses were more remarkable for their brevity than for any other quality. What the cause of his silence is, when there have been so many questions of absorbing interest before the House since his admission into it, I have no means of knowing. It is the more surprising, when one remembers his loquacity when a member of the other House. Perhaps indolence, arising from his having attained the highest object of his ambition, may have something to do in the matter. At all events his appearance indicates languor and indolence. On the only

two occasions I have heard him shortly address the House, his manner was sadly deficient in spirit and animation. He stood as motionless as the Wool-sack on which he had been sitting during the few minutes he was on his legs. His words seemed to drop from him as if they had, by some artificial process, been made to emanate from a machine. With his fine voice, his commanding person, and fair talents, he must have risen to a very high rank as a speaker, were there more life and energy in him. His voice is remarkably musical, strong, and sonorous, and is evidently capable of being modulated at pleasure, had he only that ardour of mental temperament necessary for the purpose. He is a man, as I have just intimated, of respectable talents. He has no pretensions to genius—none even to great vigour of mind; but he is never, on the other hand, feeble or absurd. You always see something in what he says which indicates a clear head and a sound judgment, coupled with a moderate energy of mind. He is always sensible, never showy. If you are never dazzled by anything witty or original, you are sure to be impressed with the conviction that there are few men of greater judgment, or more abundantly supplied with good sense, than the noble Lord. If you wish to hear the most obvious arguments on his

side of the question, and to hear them enforced in the most intelligible terms, listen to Lord Denman. His style is always easy and unaffected, sometimes it is nervous. He times his utterance to the ear with much good taste. He never falters or hesitates a moment for a word. His language flows from him like a gentle, noiseless stream.

It is well known that he would have been promoted to the judicial Bench much sooner than he was, but for the personal prejudices of George the Fourth. That monarch never forgot, neither did he ever forgive, the severe terms in which Lord Denman, then Mr. Denman, spoke of him, when Regent, in one of his speeches in defence of Queen Caroline.

Lord Denman's legal acquirements and sound judgment pointed him out as a fit person for a seat on the Bench, long before the honour was conferred on him ; and though everything which could enforce his Lordship's claims was pressed on the attention of the Sovereign, he would not for one moment entertain the proposal, but scouted it as a personal insult to himself.

Lord Denman is one of the most upright and consistent men in the House. He has undeviatingly adhered to his principles through good report and through evil report, during a public career of some

length. He is sincere and straightforward on all occasions and under every variety of circumstances. He is, consequently, though liberal on the Liberal side, much respected by the most ultra Tories. He is possessed of an equable temper, and of much urbanity of manner. Even in the stormiest discussions in which he took part in the House of Commons, when a member of that branch of the Legislature, he was invariably conciliatory in his conduct towards his opponents.

He is, as already mentioned, of a commanding personal appearance. His height exceeds the average size, while his figure is well-proportioned. He has a fine, open, manly countenance, when not on the Bench or the Woolsack. When either presiding as Judge or acting as Speaker, if I may use the term, of the House of Lords, his huge wig, in conjunction with his robes of office, impart a certain degree of gravity to his countenance. His complexion is dark, and his hair of a black colour. His face has something of the oval shape. His features are regular, and are indicative of good nature and intelligence. He is in the fifty-seventh year of his age, but, judging from his appearance only, one would take him to be considerably younger.

LORD COTTENHAM, the present Lord Chancellor, has only as yet been two months in the House.

Short, however, as is that time, he has not been a silent member. It is true that the elevated office he fills imposes on him the necessity of speaking on certain occasions; but from the notices he has given of motions, and the speeches I have repeatedly seen him volunteer, my impression is, that he will be a member of some activity from inclination. This certainly does not quadrate with his conduct in the matter of speaking when member for the borough of Malton, in the other House: there he hardly ever opened his mouth. But I have known many instances of those who were not in the habit of speaking in the Commons, becoming frequent speakers when raised to the Lords; though it must be confessed the instances are most numerous the other way,—namely, of members of the Lower House who were celebrated for their much speaking when there, becoming as mute, when elevated to the Upper House, as if their mouths had been hermetically sealed. Lord Cottenham is not a showy speaker. He speaks with some rapidity, and his elocution is not always sufficiently full and distinct. His voice has something in it which I cannot better characterise than by applying to it the term heavy: some would call it gruff. His utterance is easy: he never seems at a loss for ideas; nor does it seem to require an effort to find

suitable phraseology wherewith to express them. He always retains the most entire self-possession. I should take him to be constitutionally cool and composed. His action is moderate. It invariably consists, when he uses any at all—for he often stands stock still—of a slight movement of his right hand, usually with the cap of office in it, with an occasional movement of his face from one part of the House to the other. His language is correct, but not polished: it has a good deal of the conciseness and force of the judge in it. He is not a man of an original or vigorous mind; but you see in every thing he says the man of sound judgment. Whatever he says, too, has always the merit of being strictly to the point at issue. In politics he is moderately liberal.

He is considerably advanced in life, being in his fifty-fifth year. Time has left its traces, in the shape of wrinkles on his face. His features are large and strongly marked. His face is round, and his cheeks are very prominent in consequence of their fulness. His complexion is ruddy, and his hair is of a dark colour. His eye has something quick and piercing about it, considering his age. On his brow there is an expression of gravity, which some persons would confound with sternness. He is tall and stout. His shoulders have great

breadth, and there is much fulness about his chest. He appears, as far as one may judge from the opportunities the time he has been in the House enable him, to be much respected by all parties.

LORD LANGDALE, formerly Mr. Bickersteth, has just been raised to the Peerage, and appointed Master of the Rolls. Before his elevation, he possessed the most lucrative business at the Chancery bar. He has for many years enjoyed the deserved reputation of being a sound lawyer, and a man of great learning and talents. Originally he was destined for the medical profession, and in the prosecution of his study of the science of physic he actually passed the College of Surgeons, and afterwards attended the Countess of Oxford, whose daughter he some time after married, during a tour on the Continent, in the capacity of her medical adviser. He subsequently entered himself as a student at one of the Inns, where he applied himself with the utmost zeal and assiduity to the study of our civil jurisprudence. He had not been long called to the Bar, when his superior legal knowledge and talents brought him into distinction. Eventually he rose to the highest eminence in his profession. Some years ago he was raised to the rank of King's Counsel. For a considerable time past he confined his practice to the Rolls Court, where he and Mr.

Pemberton may be said to have had an almost complete monopoly of the business.

As a speaker he is more than respectable. His voice is deep-toned, and is sometimes modulated with considerable effect. His utterance is slightly rapid, but he is always so clear, that you never for a moment lose sight of his argument. He never soars into the higher regions of eloquence, but he always speaks to the point, and urges such arguments in favour of the view of the question which he takes, as almost invariably command the assent of the understanding.

He is in the prime of life, being about his fiftieth year. In person he is rather tall and stout, but without any thing like corpulence. His features are large and marked. His nose is prominent both from its size and its form, which approaches the aquiline. His eyes are small, but clear and full of intelligence; they are also always indicative of a cheerful disposition. He is short-sighted and uses a double eye-glass. His complexion is sallow, and his hair grey. His head is partially bald. It is well shaped; the forepart of it, especially, is finely developed.

Lord HATHERTON is as yet but imperfectly known as a member of the Upper House. As Mr. Littleton, he was one of the best known

members in the House of Commons. The situation of Secretary for Ireland, which he filled under the Ministry of Earl Grey, necessarily gave him an unusual prominence in the public eye. He is a nobleman of very considerable talents. He possesses a clear understanding, and much coolness and self-possession in circumstances which would embarrass the generality of men. His mind is not remarkable for its vigour, though in this respect he is above mediocrity; but his judgment may in most cases be confidently relied on. He certainly committed one egregious error of judgment in prematurely communicating to O'Connell the intention of Ministers with regard to the repeal of the Coercion Bill for Ireland: but that was under peculiar circumstances, and from motives so praiseworthy, that but for the disastrous results to the then existing Government, which followed, they would almost have atoned for the indiscretion. As a business man he had few superiors when in office. The distinguishing feature of his mind is its practical good sense. He has nothing of the enthusiast or visionary in his constitution. As a speaker, he is one of the most unequal in either House. Those who hear him at one time will often have difficulty in persuading themselves it is the same person, when

hearing him at another. His matter is always clear; not only do the ideas he means to express stand forth distinctly and in their proper order in his own mind, but the dullest comprehension cannot fail to perceive them. It is often otherwise as regards his manner of expressing himself. Though sometimes as clear, smooth, natural, and easy, as it were possible for man to be, he is at others very confused, hesitating for want of proper terms, stammering out broken disjointed sentences, then recalling them, and afterwards supplying their places with others scarcely less unhappy. His maiden speech, in the Session of 1835, in the House of Lords, afforded a striking illustration of this. In that case, however, there was an excuse for him, as a first effort at speaking in that place might very reasonably be supposed to disconcert a person but newly raised to the honour of a seat in it. But it is right to add, that he was sometimes equally unhappy in the House of Commons. When there existed no adventitious cause for his breaking down, he was usually clear, easy, and natural in his delivery. His ideas are generally good, though there is nothing original or profound in them. He almost invariably takes the common-sense view of a subject, and employs those arguments in favour of it which would naturally occur to a

man of sound understanding, who applied his mind to the question. His language, excepting in those cases in which he breaks down, is correct, but has few of what are called the graces of style. I do not recollect to have ever known him make use of a trope or figure in the many speeches I have heard him deliver: he never attempts the loftier flights of oratory. He contents himself with humbler aims; he is satisfied if he have convinced the House that his is the right view of the subject, without troubling himself as to what opinion is formed of the speech.

His voice is clear and pleasant, but wants variety. He speaks in the same tone throughout. His articulation is good; it is quite distinct notwithstanding the rapidity of his delivery. He is moderate in his use of gesticulation: a limited but rapid sweep of his right arm constitutes the only action he exhibits.

His personal appearance is prepossessing. There are few men who can boast of a more commanding countenance: his features are regular in no ordinary degree. His eyes assimilate to the blue, and are full of intelligence: his forehead is lofty and ample. Gall or Spurzheim could have wished to "feel" no better in endeavouring to establish their phrenological theory. His complexion has

something of a modified clearness about it—if such an expression be a correct one. His hair is of a dark brown: his face is full and round, without the slightest approach to corpulency. It is redolent of health, and of a cheerful and happy disposition of mind,—a quality which is anything but common among our senators. He is tall and of a firm robust make. His constitution is evidently strong. If one might infer with unerring certainty the duration of one's life, from the indications of present health, he would have no scruple in whispering into Lord Hatherton's ear the very gratifying intelligence that he is destined to see, in addition to the forty-five summers' suns which have already shone upon him, at least forty or fifty more. But observation, if not experience, admonishes all men that such indications are not always to be trusted, though certainly very gratifying, inasmuch as they constitute a sort of presumptive evidence, though not of a very high order, of prolonged life.

The name of Lord TEYNHAM is pretty familiar to the public ear, though his voice is seldom heard in the House: I believe he has not spoken half a dozen times, and even then not more than a few sentences at a time, since the occurrence of certain circumstances a few years ago, which introduced him to his countrymen in an unpleasantly prominent

manner. Indeed, he is not often to be seen in the House. His practice is, when any question of importance is before it, to come down to the House at eleven or twelve o'clock, just when the debate is about to close, and give his vote. He is not a nobleman of much talent: indeed, he is below rather than above mediocrity. I lately heard him speak, or rather attempt to speak—for he was soon put down—a few months since, at a meeting of the friends of the agricultural interest, held in the Freemason's tavern. He is a poor speaker; there is little grace in his action, and still less music in his voice: it is disagreeably loud, and harsh, and croaking in its tones. When he used to speak occasionally in his place in Parliament, he was so much in the habit of placing the emphasis on the wrong words, and also of giving an awkward emphasis into the bargain, that noble Lords deemed it quite an infliction to hear him. On such occasions the idea used to shoot athwart their minds, that if deafness had its disadvantages, it had also its advantages. His gesture, as I have already stated, is ungraceful—I should have added, it is very violent. If the mental acquirements or oratorical abilities of a person were to be measured by the liberal or moderate use he makes of gesticulation, then Lord Teynham would be entitled

to occupy a distinguished place among the orators of the day. His politics are decidedly liberal.

His personal appearance is not more prepossessing than his oratory. He is rather tall and stout: his walking is as bad as his talking:—I know of no better term though it be a homely one, whereby to express his mode of walking, than to say, as in the case of the King, that he “waddles.” His style of dressing is not in accordance with his rank; few journeymen tradesmen would exchange their holiday clothes for his Lordship’s wardrobe. His countenance has nothing remarkable in it; it is best described by the use of a negative phrase—it is not good-looking. He has passed the meridian of life, being in his fifty-eighth year.

CHAPTER XV.

NEUTRAL PEERS.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND—THE EARL OF RIPON.

THE Duke of RICHMOND is a man of considerable weight in the House, not from any superiority of talent or dexterity as a debater, but from his being the representative of one of the most respectable and ancient families in England, joined to an excellent private character. His intellectual powers are not above mediocrity. He never makes a speech in which there are any traces of superior ability. His mind wants vigour and originality; he never strikes out a new course of argument for himself when discussing any question. His arguments are always those which lie on the surface, and they are so obvious that no man not wilfully blind could fail to perceive them. His language is in accordance with his ideas. It certainly cannot be said to be inaccurate, but it wants polish, and is defective in power. He never,

by accident, stumbles on an eloquent or energetic passage. He has, however, the merit of being always clear in every thing he says. You never can mistake the position he wishes to establish, nor can you entertain a moment's doubt as to the nature of the arguments by which he endeavours to establish those positions. A school-boy of the most ordinary comprehension could, with the greatest ease, follow him from the commencement to the close of his longest speeches. If he never says anything brilliant, neither does he, on the other hand, say anything absolutely silly or stupid. His speeches have always the commodity of common-sense to recommend them. He speaks often, but seldom long at a time. He never has anything in the shape of exordium or peroration in his most lengthened addresses. He rushes into the midst of his subject the moment he opens his mouth, and the probability is that you will find the last sentence he utters the best argument he has used in the course of his speech. When I say the last sentence, I of course exclude that expression of thanks for the attention with which the House has been pleased to listen to him,—with which almost all the fourth and fifth rate class of speakers usually conclude their speeches.

His Grace is not wordy ; though his ideas are

not of a high order of merit, there is a goodly number of them in all his speeches. There are few men in the House who will condense a greater number of ideas and arguments into more limited space.

He is always listened to with attention; and considerable importance is attached by the majority of Peers to what he says. His secession from the Grey Ministry was regarded both by the friends and foes of that government, as an occurrence tending in some measure to shake its stability. Though greatly inferior to Earl Ripon as a speaker, and though by no means equal to him in mental resources generally, his secession from Earl Grey's Ministry gave that Ministry a much heavier blow than did the secession of Lord Ripon. The moral weight of the noble Duke chiefly arises, as I before stated, from the great respectability of his family, coupled with his excellent private character.

He is very regular in his attendance on his parliamentary duties; few Peers are more frequently to be seen in the House. He is also understood to be extremely conscientious in his conduct. Whatever be the line of conduct he pursues, he always acts from his convictions of right. I know of no man less liable to the imputation of acting from improper motives.

Of late years he has made rapid advances in the liberality of his opinions. Before the passing of the Reform Bill, he was a decided Tory. From the passing of that measure until his secession from the Administration of Earl Grey, he always was the zealous advocate of every liberal and enlightened measure brought into the House. Since then, however, he has looked with suspicion both on the Government of the noble Earl, during its short existence after his resignation, and on that of Lord Melbourne, though frequently supporting the latter. He sits on the neutral benches; and I know of no man who has a better right to a seat there. I question if there be a member of either House who is more guided in the course he pursues by his abstract notions of what the justice of the case demands.

There is one singular feature in the character of his Grace. He evinces as much zeal—it is not for me to say whether or not he feels as much—on questions which are only of comparatively trifling importance, as on the most momentous measures which can come before the House. The zeal he manifested against the bill of last Session, for transferring the cattle-market held at Smithfield to Islington, was extraordinary. Though the destinies of the world had been suspended on the fate of that

measure, he could not have met it with a more strenuous or determined opposition. He opposed it in every stage. On the second or third reading—I forget which—after speaking alone in decided opposition to it, he divided the House, though he knew beforehand, what the event proved, that, with the exception of himself, all the Peers present were in favour of the measure.

His appearance and manners are plain. There is nothing foppish in his dress, nor affected in his manners. He is a nobleman in whose company one could soon make himself at ease. He appears full of mildness and good-nature. I never yet knew him give expression to anything which indicated an angry or unkind feeling towards any man: never did personality, or anything calumnious of an opponent, escape his lips. A spirit of good feeling towards every body breathes throughout every thing he says. And his manner is as kindly as his matter; it is mild and unassuming in the highest degree.

He speaks in a low, and weak, but pleasant tone of voice. He is generally audible, but never anything more. He uses no gesture farther than an occasional gentle movement of his right arm.

In person, the noble Duke is about the average height. He is of a thin spare make; his face is

of a sharp angular form; his complexion is dark, and the colour of his hair is moderately black. He is in his forty-fifth year.

Lord RIPON has not of late years taken an active part in public affairs, compared with the previous frequency with which his name appeared in the public journals. When Mr. Robinson, or "Prosperity Robinson *," as he was then called in the House of Commons, there was no man whose name was oftener in people's mouths. And when Lord Goderich, especially during the four months of his Administration, he was constantly in the public eye. Since, however, his accession to the title of Earl Ripon, to which elevation he was raised in 1832, he has been almost mute in Parliament; and has neither said nor done anything elsewhere, to keep the public recollection of him alive. Two or three speeches in the course of an entire Session, are all that he has made for the last three years. What can have induced a man—who is not only, as I will speedily mention at greater length, a good speaker, but who is still in the prime of life, not having exceeded his fifty-fourth year,—

* This soubriquet was given him by way of ridicule, owing to his always representing, when Chancellor of the Exchequer, the finances of the country as in a most prosperous state.

thus virtually to seal up his lips on public affairs—and especially during such a period as the last few years—is one of those things which are, to the uninitiated, matter of mystery. It can hardly be from disappointed ambition; for the dissolution of the short-lived Ministry of which he was the head, was not brought about either by the open hostility or covert opposition of his enemies, but was an act of his own free will. Neither could the circumstance of his ceasing to be a member of the Grey Ministry have proved a wound to his ambition: for that also was his own voluntary act. But, be the cause what it may, the fact is as I have stated.

He is one of the most fluent and animated speakers in the House. I have hardly ever heard a man whose diction was more copious. It is so to a fault. In his anxiety to round his periods, and render his sentences as elegant as possible, he often weakens his style, and destroys the effect his speeches would otherwise produce. His language sounds most euphoniously in your ears; but owing to the number of words he employs to express his ideas, you sometimes lose sight of the latter altogether; they are literally buried amidst a heap of verbiage. And what aggravates the evil is, that, if you are at the trouble to search for them, you

will often, in the event of discovering them, find they are unworthy of the amount of labour expended.

This, however, is by no means always, or, perhaps, even generally, the case. He never soars into the higher regions of intellect; but is often above mediocrity. His intellectual character may be most fitly described by the word superior. If you are never startled by anything original or brilliant, neither do you ever become wearied with him. He is always pleasing; and always urges arguments which have the attribute of common-sense to recommend them. To the singular fluency of his delivery, and the easy and copious flow of his words, he unites by far the finest voice in the House. It is musical in a high degree:—you can almost suppose you hear him singing his speech. Were it not that he wants the power of modulating his voice to any extent, his speeches would always produce an effect, however indifferent the matter. It is true, he begins in a lower tone than that in which he speaks when he has got fairly into the subject; but the ascent in the scale of loudness is so gradual, that you do not perceive it till he has well nigh reached the highest point. That attained, he continues in the same key till the conclusion of his speech. His voice, therefore, is in

effect quite monotonous. The most solemn and most ludicrous things, the deepest tragedy and lightest comedy, are all delivered in the same tones of voice. His utterance is rapid; but he never uses a wrong word instead of the right one; nor does he ever seem to have the least difficulty in selecting the most elegant and appropriate phraseology. He speaks as rapidly and smoothly as if he were reciting some beautiful piece of composition which he had carefully committed to memory.

But this is not the case. His speeches are almost invariably extemporaneous. In no instance does he ever prepare them fully beforehand: when he does anything in the way of previous preparation, it is only to the extent of fixing on the general train of observation he will pursue, or of elaborating particular passages of his speech. You see at once by the energy of his manner, and by the nature of the references he makes to the speeches of others,—that he himself addresses the House under the impulse of the moment.

In saying that the noble Earl is so copious in his phraseology, and that he speaks with remarkable ease and fluency, I beg to be understood as applying the observations to the way in which he usually acquits himself when addressing the House: on some

occasions he completely breaks down, owing to excessive nervousness. This, however, never happens in making what is called a chance speech : in every instance in which it occurs, it is when he has to make a set speech on some question of great importance. The overwhelming impression he has of the importance of particular questions, is the cause of his embarrassment. If, in addition to its intrinsic importance, the necessity is imposed on him of going through a variety of statistical details, the chances are greatly increased that he will break down before the end of his speech ; he has had a special horror of figures and facts ever since his elevation to the Peerage. This is the more surprising, as the situation of Chancellor of the Exchequer, which he filled in the Lower House, led him so often, of necessity, into mere questions of figures and facts, which one would think would have inured him to such matters. It is, indeed, surprising that, under any circumstances, one who has had so much experience as a public speaker should become nervous. One remarkable instance of the extent to which he is sometimes afflicted by this nervousness, occurred in the session of 1834, when bringing in the bill for the Emancipation of the Negroes in the West Indies. On that occasion he felt so completely

paralysed, as not only to make some dead stops, but to become obliged to sit down until he could recover in some measure his self-possession.

He is constitutionally a man of weak nerves. He has no moral courage—no decision of mind. He got on pretty comfortably in the Lower House when Chancellor of the Exchequer, because, though Mr. Hume and other “men of figures” sometimes took him to task, he was always sure—Parliament being then unreformed—of majorities of five or six to one, in his favour. Not only does he suffer under opposition; he is almost frightened out of his propriety by the bare anticipation of it. It was the apprehension of the attacks which, as Prime Minister, he would necessarily have to encounter on the meeting of Parliament, that caused him, quite unexpectedly on the part of the public, to break up his own Administration in 1827.

One leading characteristic of his speeches is, the want of anything decisive as to the opinions he holds on the subject under discussion. If he mean to vote against the question before the House he commences by urging arguments against it; but before he has got half through he is sure to make so many admissions in favour of the opposite side, that all his arguments for his own view

of it, are neutralised in your mind ; and you cannot possibly see how he can, with any show of consistency, after the arguments he has advanced on the one side, and the concessions he has made to the other, vote for either. The claims of both sides are so nicely balanced by him, that, whatever may be your own private opinion, you could not, had you spoken as he had done, vote on either side. On other occasions the extent of his concessions to the opposite side are such, that one who had no previous intimation of the course he meant to pursue, would conclude his vote would be in favour of that side.

Ever since his secession from the Grey Administration he has sat on the neutral benches ; but he is seldom to be seen in the House, except when some question of commanding importance is expected to come on for discussion.

His gesture is redundant. He moves his body about in every direction—raises both his hands above his head at once—and then throws them down to his knees. One favourite attitude of the noble Earl, is that of throwing his head and body so far backwards, as to make you uneasy about his retaining his equilibrium. Then again he throws himself forward ; and but for the bench before

which he stands, he certainly would, in some of his more extravagant "moves," run a risk of falling on his face. It appears singular when one compares his indecision of action with the violence of his manner in most of his speeches.

CHAPTER XVI.

LORDS SPIRITUAL.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY—THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN—THE BISHOP OF EXETER—THE BISHOP OF LONDON—THE BISHOP OF DURHAM—THE BISHOP OF HEREFORD.

DR. WILLIAM HOWLEY, Archbishop of Canterbury, is not a man of any grasp or vigour of mind. In any of the speeches I have heard him deliver, I could never recognise anything which rose above mediocrity. His conceptions are always clear; no one ever feels at a loss to perceive his drift, notwithstanding his extremely awkward manner of delivery—of which I shall have to speak presently. It were oft-times better for himself that he had the knack for which the late Lord Castlereagh was so celebrated, of concealing his sentiments by using an unmeaning phraseology; or, it were still better, if, on many occasions, he remained in his seat when he gets to his legs—for few men more

frequently commit themselves by uttering things which prudence would suggest should be confined to their own bosoms. Many a time, by his unguarded expressions, does he afford a handle to his enemies, of which a more prudent or dexterous person would deprive them. His speeches in opposition to the claims of the Catholics, and to those of the Dissenters at a later period, abounded with indiscretions of the kind to which I have referred. He is no tactician; he cannot play the Jesuit with effect, even if he were anxious to do so. He wants dexterity; he is a soft, easy, straightforward sort of man; with a good deal of that aristocratic opinion of himself which has a tendency to blind him to consequences which other persons cannot fail to perceive will ensue from his statements, positions, and admissions. Of all the speeches which are made on his side of the House, in favour of his view of the question, his own is sure to be the easiest for an opponent to answer, and to afford the most tacit admissions in favour of the opposite side of the question. He is never ingenious or clever; he never makes out a plausible case in favour of his own view of the question. He has no pretensions to be regarded as a reasoner; whatever he might do where he to sit down to commit his ideas to paper, he certainly has never,

during the years I have been in the habit of hearing him speak in the House of Lords, delivered anything entitled to the name of argument.

His manner is still worse than his matter. I have never heard a worse speaker, in so far as regards his enunciation. He stammers and stutters and misplaces his words, at every fourth or fifth sentence; and often occupies as much time in correcting the imperfections of one sentence, as might have sufficed to deliver two or three more. It is a wonder, too, if he leave the amended sentence in the best possible taste, after he has lavished his alterations and improvements on it. His style, even during the short intervals—few and far between, however—in which he gets on pretty creditably, is not good. It is weak; and often rough and disjointed. In written composition, it is right to add, his Grace has a better reputation; it is said his style is then elegant and correct.

He has a fine clear voice, which is melodious and sonorous in its tones. He has no animation, and uses no gesture when speaking. He stands stock still, never moving hand or foot till he resume his seat. The personal appearance of the Archbishop is highly prepossessing and commanding. His countenance beams with mildness and courtesy; and his whole demeanour

confirms the favourable impression which his personal appearance has made on your mind. His manners are so conciliating, that however much you may disapprove of his sentiments, it is impossible you can regard the man with hostility. Even the late Lord King, the sworn enemy of the Bishops, could never speak of the Archbishop of Canterbury with anything approaching to asperity.

He is as zealous as ever in his attachment to the Church, in its collective capacity; but his predilections are in favour of the moderate party. His opposition to the admission of Evangelical Clergy into the Establishment, has always been most strenuous; and he has never let slip an opportunity of offering the most determined resistance to the elevation, either of those of them previously within its pale, or of those against whom he found it impossible to shut its doors. The Evangelical party, indeed, he considers but little better than Dissenters—to whom he is said to be intolerant in his conduct, though conciliatory in his words. His intolerance, however, is not of that kind which would sanction a recurrence to the penal enactments of a former period.

His undiminished zeal in favour of the Hierarchy insures his regular attendance in the House, although the weight of nearly seventy years presses

upon him, whenever any question bearing on the interests of the Church is to be brought under consideration. On all such questions he is sure to speak; seldom, however, at any length. He always, from the station he holds in the Church, commands the deepest attention, notwithstanding the unattractiveness of his manner, and the inferior quality of his matter. When in the prime of life, he often used to speak on the general topics of legislation; and is said to have generally evinced enlightened views and varied knowledge,—when his judgment was not warped by his ultra Tory political opinions.

He is understood to have much of the aristocrat in his composition. Under the mildest and most conciliatory exterior, it is said, by those who know him best, he conceals much of the haughtiness arising from conscious superiority of birth and station.

In personal height he is a little above the middle size. His figure rather inclines to the slender. His face is thin, and his features are deeply marked.

DR. WHATELEY, Archbishop of Dublin, is better known as an author, than as a legislator. In the former capacity he stands unrivalled among his contemporaries in the particular departments of literature to which he has specially applied himself. His works on Rhetoric and Logic are,

perhaps, the best which have ever been written on the subject. They abound with evidences of profound thought, varied knowledge, great mental acuteness, and superior powers of reasoning. His theological creed cannot, according to the representations of persons who have entered the lists with him, be commended for its orthodoxy. It is said by them to be at direct variance with the leading doctrines embodied in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church to which he belongs. It is no part of my plan to advert to matters which do not immediately bear on the conduct of those of whom I speak in their capacity of members of the Legislature; otherwise I should specify the most important of the many alleged points of difference between him and the Church of England, with regard to doctrinal matters. One of the heterodox notions which the Right Rev. Prelate is said to hold, is, that the moral law was superseded by the Christian dispensation, and that, consequently, it is not binding on Christians. In politics he is liberal. He always acts with the Whigs. He is a zealous supporter of the present Government; and it is understood they are, in a great measure, guided by his advice in their plans of Church Reform. In the House he is hardly of any use to them, farther than the sanction which

his name gives to their measures. He is no speaker: when he does get on his legs, which, however, he never does unless some sort of necessity is imposed on him, he always appears anxious to resume his seat as soon as possible. He knows that oratory is not his forte. He has a shrewd suspicion, too, that all who hear him have the same notion. In that he is quite right. He goes through his addresses—which, however, have always the merit of brevity—in so clumsy and inanimate a way, that noble Lords at once come to the conclusion, that nothing so befits him as an unbroken silence. He speaks in so low a tone of voice, as to be inaudible to those who are any distance from him. And not only is his voice low in its tones, but it is unpleasant from its monotony. In his manner there is not a particle of life or spirit. You would fancy his Grace to be half asleep while speaking; you see so little appearance of consciousness about him, that you can hardly help doubting whether his legs will support him until he has finished his address.

And his personal appearance is in excellent keeping with his manner as a speaker. He is tall and stout; but to say that, gives you no correct idea of the man. You have that idea, however, in two words, he is “heavy looking.”

You would fancy he laboured under a deeply settled melancholy, mingled with an unconquerable bashfulness. His face is full and round. His features are, on the whole, regular. His complexion is fresh; if you met him in the street, you would at once infer that he must be newly arrived in town, either after a long sea-voyage, or from some part of the United Kingdom, in which he had been for months enjoying the bracing breezes of the open fields. His hair is dark, and he generally has a profusion of it. He has entered his sixty-second year, but most persons would conclude from his general appearance, that he was at least seven or eight years younger.

DR. PHILLPOTTS, Bishop of Exeter, is undoubtedly the most talented man who sits on the Right Rev. Bench. His personal appearance attracts attention the moment he rises to address the House. He possesses a tall, finely formed figure, which, with his handsome, intellectual countenance, is very imposing. There is something strikingly characteristic of mental acquirements in the expression of his countenance. His forehead is lofty, finely formed, and full of character; while his dark, intelligent eye fully verifies, whatever others may do, the celebrated remark of one of the ancients, that the eyes are the windows of the soul.

His dark hair, like the quills of the fretful porcupine, stands on end on the fore part of his head; not naturally, but is made to do so by the aid of a comb—to display, no doubt, to the greatest advantage, his finely developed forehead. His face rather inclines to the oval form; while his features are small and regular. His complexion is rather dark, but is not indicative of good health. He is in the meridian of life, being only about his forty-fifth year.

He rises to address the House with an ease and dignity of manner, which concur with his commanding person, to produce the effect to which I have already alluded, of attracting the stranger's attention. I might have added, that the generality of spectators, on first seeing Dr. Phillpotts rise for the purpose of making a speech, are so taken with his personal appearance as to make them quite inattentive to the matter of his speech. There is a calm collectedness in his manner—a mildness and candour in his countenance—and a soft, subdued, yet clear tone in his voice, when he commences his speech, which have a very winning effect on all who hear him. For some time he proceeds in slow and measured accents—with as little animation or gesture as if he had no power whatever over his body. After

apologising for trespassing on the attention of noble Lords, and assuring them that, while on the one hand, he has only been induced to obtrude himself on their notice by an overpowering sense of duty, so on the other, he will trouble them with as few observations as possible—he goes on to make a few general remarks on the question before the House, and to indicate to their Lordships the particular part of the question to which he intends chiefly to apply himself. When he has got fairly into the middle of his subject, his voice becomes louder and his enunciation a little more rapid; but still there is no appearance of warmth in his manner. He continues to the end apparently as cold and motionless as he was when he commenced. It were wrong, however, to infer from the utter absence of all gesture in the Right Rev. Prelate, that there is no feeling in his speeches. He feels strongly on most questions of importance which come before the House; though that feeling be not expressed by any animation or energy of manner. The mere matter of his speeches—the decision of their tone—the research they display—the great care he has manifestly bestowed on their preparation, show that he must have felt no ordinary interest in the question before it was brought under the notice of the

House, and that the issue of the debate is regarded by him with an interest of no ordinary intensity.

The ease and dignity of manner which so forcibly strike every person present on Dr. Phillpotts' rising, are sustained throughout. His sentiments and arguments flow from the lips with a smoothness and facility in the delivery which are seldom witnessed on either side of the House. Occasionally—but even then but very seldom—when quoting from memory extracts from the writings of others, he does stammer slightly; never, however, to an extent to render his delivery unpleasant. You see in his calm and tranquil manner, the consciousness of superior intellectual resources; and he always takes care, by the force and ingenuity of his arguments, to make his opponents feel that this consciousness is not unfounded. I know of no member of either House, whose appearance, when speaking, is more fascinating than that of the Right Rev. gentleman. No one ever saw him exhibit the slightest symptoms of irritated feeling. His countenance has as placid an aspect when speaking, as if his eyes were sealed up in the deepest and most tranquil sleep. It is in admirable keeping with the singular mildness of the tones of his voice.

In his language, he never transgresses the rules of gentlemanly courtesy. He treats his opponents in the most respectful manner. He seems as if incapable, under any circumstance, and however great the provocation, of applying to any antagonist a single term which that antagonist could by possibility consider of a personal nature. But he generally gives abundant cause of soreness or mortification to the noble Lord to whom he replies by the masterly way in which he demolishes his positions.

Some persons say that the singular mildness and urbanity of Dr. Phillpotts' manner is affected, not real; that he assumes a virtue which he has not. If he does adopt the advice of one of Shakspeare's most popular characters, and look like the innocent rose while he is the serpent underneath it,—he is certainly entitled to the credit of doing it with inimitable effect. Those who question the sincerity of the seeming good-nature and mildness of his manner, refer, in proof of their opinion on the subject, to some of his pamphlets on the Catholic question, where, they contend, there are abundant proofs of asperity and abuse. I do not at this moment recollect the style in which these pamphlets were written, nor does it come within my province to advert to his temper

as a writer ; I speak of his mildness and good temper only as a speaker in the House of Lords : and certainly, during the several years I have seen him in his place there, I never in a single instance heard him utter a word, or saw anything in his manner which could, for a moment, justify me in inferring that his mild and courteous manner was only assumed, not real.

There is not a man in either House who is listened to with greater attention than Dr. Phillpotts. When he rises to address their Lordships, every eye is fixed on him, and every ear is open to receive the words which are about to fall from his lips ; nor, however long he may occupy their time, do any of their Lordships betray any signs of impatience. This is the more surprising when one considers the marked tameness of his manner. Nothing but the impression, *à priori*, that something singularly able is about to be addressed to them, could, in the first place, excite their attention ; and nothing but the actual delivery of something of superior merit could keep up that attention to the end, after it has been awakened.

I mentioned in the outset that he is unquestionably the most talented man on the bench of Bishops. I might have added that, with the exception of Lords Brougham and Lyndhurst, he is,

perhaps, the ablest man on either side of the House. His speeches are, I should say, more strictly and closely argumentative than those of any man in either House. Whatever can be urged in favour of his view of the subject, is sure to be urged by him; and urged, too, in the clearest and most forcible manner. He exhausts the subject. No one need expect to say anything after him which will have the double merit of being new and apposite. He shows you that he has examined the question in all its bearings, and that he has discovered everything in it which can be urged with effect in favour of his own view of it. In his more elaborate speeches, he displays to advantage the extent of his learning. His arguments are not only powerful in themselves, but they are expressed with great clearness and effect. You never misapprehend the train of his reasoning; nor does he ever enfeeble his argument by an undue amplification. He first places one argument before you in the clearest possible manner, and in the fewest possible words: that done, he takes care to anticipate and demolish in a sentence or two any objections that may be taken to it; and when he has thus made himself invulnerable on one point to any opponent who may follow him, he proceeds with his remaining arguments in the

same manner. The result is, that not only does he commit himself in his reasonings to a less extent than any other Peer, but his antagonists are aware that his speeches afford less room than those of any one else on his side of the House for an effective reply, and therefore the Liberal Peers are more unwilling to enter the arena with him than with any other Peer, temporal or spiritual, on his side of the question.

In saying that the Bishop of Exeter is, perhaps, the most close and powerful reasoner in the House, I must not be understood as meaning that his arguments are always legitimate. I must do him the justice to say, that where fair argument is available to his view of the question, he is not only sure to press it into his service, but he does not have recourse to sophistry. But when legitimate argument cannot be used in favour of the side he espouses, he does not hesitate to resort to sophistry. And of this mode of discomfiting an opponent, and making out his own case, he is a perfect master. He has no superior as a sophist in the House. His only equal is Lord Lyndhurst.

Dr. Phillpotts has suffered more, in the estimation of the country, from the singular circumstances under which he changed his opinions, or at least his conduct, on the Catholic question, than he has

done in that of the House. There the circumstance is not only never alluded to, but seems not to have lessened his influence in the smallest degree. So far he has been much more fortunate than Sir Robert Peel. The Right Hon. Baronet has not yet recovered, nor ever will recover with his own party, the loss of character he sustained by his change of conduct on that question.

The superior talents of the Bishop of Exeter were strikingly exhibited in the way in which he spoke and wrote on both sides of the Catholic question. His arguments against any concessions to the Roman Catholics were never triumphantly answered until he virtually did it himself by the arguments he advanced in favour of the removal of their disabilities. While every one, whatever were his opinions on the subject, looked with suspicion, to use the mildest term, on his change of conduct, with regard to the measure of Emancipation, no one could withhold his admiration of the singular ability with which he justified the removal of Catholic disabilities. In that matter he acquitted himself much better than Sir Robert Peel: the latter did not, after he became an advocate of the measure, display half the talent which he did when opposing it. The Bishop of Exeter appeared to equal advantage on both sides.

Dr. Phillpotts' style is correct, but simple. There is no ornament in it. He hardly ever makes use of a metaphor, or introduces imagery of any description into his speeches: and yet his style is often eloquent in a very high degree. It possesses that eloquence which approves itself to the judgment, though it never warms the heart by appeals to the passions. It is an eloquence of that kind which can only be perceived and duly appreciated by an unusually refined audience: it would be like throwing pearls before swine to address it to the multitude.

The happiest effort which the Right Rev. Prelate has made for some years past, was made last year, when the House was in committee on the New Poor Law Bill. On that occasion he brought forward a motion in opposition to the clause which compels the mother of an illegitimate child, and failing her, her parents, if alive, to support that child,—while the father, who possibly seduced the girl, escapes without punishment in any shape whatever. A specimen of purer eloquence—a display of more masterly argumentation—or a speech breathing from beginning to end a loftier order of humanity, has seldom been delivered within the walls of either House of the Legislature. It occupied about three hours in the delivery, during which time the noble Lords on

both sides of the House listened to the Right Rev. Prelate with an attention as unbroken and undiminished as it was intense. And seldom has a speech, either in the House of Lords, or in that of the Commons, been the means of proselytizing so many of the audience to the views of the speaker. It is well known that many noble Lords went down to the House that evening, with the full intention of voting against Dr. Phillpotts' amendment, who were not only convinced by the arguments and eloquence of the Right Rev. Prelate, but evinced the sincerity of that conviction by voting with him.

The Right Rev. gentleman, as may be inferred from what I have already stated, carefully prepares his speeches before delivering them. It would otherwise be impossible to give those numerous quotations he introduces in them from other authorities, in favour of his view of the question, with so much judgment and effect. Neither would it be possible that he could evince so perfect an arrangement of his matter, and follow up his arguments with so much logical accuracy in all their bearings, on the contrary supposition. But, though Dr. Phillpotts' does not trust himself on any great occasion to the suggestions of the moment, he acquits himself very creditably when the necessity

is imposed on him of speaking extemporaneously. He is not disconcerted by interruptions, which, however, occur but very rarely in his case: nor does he betray confusion or hesitation when replying to any one who has questioned his positions, or combated his arguments. He knows, however, that extemporaneous speaking in replying to a noble Lord on the opposite side is not his forte, and consequently never attempts when he can help it.

On purely political questions he does not speak often. He usually reserves all his energies for questions bearing more or less directly on the interests of the Established Church. Of that Church, constituted as she is, he is a most zealous champion; and beyond all comparison the ablest advocate of whom she can boast at this moment. On religious subjects, his opinions are what are called moderate: he dislikes the Evangelical party in his own Church, and is looked on by that party with no favourable eye. He is as intolerant towards the Dissenters in religion as he is opposed to the Liberals in politics. He does not, however, openly glory, as some of his Right Rev. brethren on the Bench do, in his hostility to them. He rather conceals it in all those cases in which he cannot clearly see the advantage of avowing it. When an

opportunity does present itself of attacking the Dissenters with every prospect of effect, he never lets it slip: he seizes it with avidity, and turns it to the best account.

DR. BLOMFIELD, Bishop of London, has many qualities in common with the Bishop of Exeter. He fully shares in his hostility to the Dissenters, and in his zeal for the Church. He is a man, also, of a clear head, a sound judgment, and great felicity in the expression of his sentiments. His manner, too, like that of the Bishop of Exeter, is cold. His voice is equally clear, with much greater strength; so that with the least possible exertion of his lungs, he is distinctly heard in every part of the House. In addressing their Lordships, he stands as motionless as if he were a statue. No one, not even when it is evident, from the nature of the sentiments to which he is giving utterance, that he feels the deepest interest in the subject,—no one ever yet saw him raise his arm, or use any other kind of gesture. In the expression of his countenance there is also a good deal of similarity to the features of his Right Rev. brother of Exeter. It is true his face has more of rotundity, and his complexion has more of clearness mixed with ruddiness about it; but he also can boast of a finely formed and lofty forehead, clear dark

eyes, and a countenance beaming with intelligence, mingled with a mild and tranquil expression. His hair is likewise dark, but he is but sparingly supplied with it. I believe he is the most bald-headed member of the House ; always, of course, excepting those whose wigs conceal the extent of their baldness. He is more advanced in life than his Right Rev. brother, being about his fiftieth year. His personal appearance is prepossessing, but not so much so as that of the Bishop of Exeter. He is corpulent, and scarcely reaches the middle height. Like Dr. Phillpotts, he is in excellent health, and has every prospect of attaining a good old age, in so far as the future may in such a case be judged of by the present.

In intellectual power and resources, though considerably above mediocrity, he is far inferior to the Bishop of Exeter. The leading characteristics of his mind are the clearness with which he perceives a point, and the ease and precision with which he expresses himself. He never hits on an original or ingenious course of argument, nor ever strikes any one by the force or appropriateness of his illustrations ; but he excels in picking up those arguments in favour of his view of the question which lie on the surface, and exhibiting them in the clearest possible light to your view. The con-

clusions to which he would conduct you are always clear to his own mind's eye ; so is the path through which he would lead you to them ; and he makes both equally perceptible to yours. He never seeks to compel you to follow him ; he walks away, as it were, at his own ease, and seems to say—"This is the way ; I shall be glad of your company, if you are so inclined ; if not, I must go by myself." He is always mild and respectful to his opponents. He never suffers a harsh or offensive expression to escape his lips : even when angrily assailed, as he sometimes is, or misrepresented, as he occasionally conceives himself to be, he never meets his antagonist in the same spirit. He is quite innocent of returning railing for railing, or evil for evil. He never speaks long at a time ; but he speaks pretty often. He does not seem to be ambitious of making a display : he rather appears to me to act on the adage of—"Say away, then, and be done with it." You see when he rises he has something which he considers it is of great importance to deliver himself of ; and all the time he is on his legs he hurries through it as fast as he can. I do not mean by "hurrying" that he speaks rapidly or inarticulately ; on the contrary, his utterance is rather slow ; while his articulation is, perhaps, as perfect as that of any member in the House. What I

mean by his hurrying through his speech, or, in other words, to the object he has in view, is, that he never digresses for the purpose of speech-making; he contents himself with leading principles and leading arguments, deeming them sufficient for his purpose. The Right Rev. Prelate's language is most simple and perspicuous: there is no glitter of words, no meretricious ornament in his style, which bears some resemblance to the Addisonian. He excels in giving a great quantity of matter in few words. Almost every sentence contains a sentiment, though he seldom or never, as already stated, gives utterance to any thing original or profound. The character of his ideas, arguments, and illustrations, will be understood when I designate them as somewhat above mediocrity.

Like the Bishop of Exeter, he has a perfect controul over his temper. He is known to have strong likings and strong dislikings; but his speeches never furnish the least indication of this. However violently attacked by others, he never, as before stated, betrays any loss of temper. When complaining of a misconstruction of his language, or a misapprehension of his meaning, (which, by the way, he does oftener than any other member, in proportion to the number of the speeches he delivers), he does so with the greatest possible

meekness; not only never uttering an ill-natured word in return, but always charitably ascribing the misconstruction or misapprehension to a want of sufficient perspicuity in the phraseology he himself has employed.

Dr. Blomfield is an excellent Greek scholar. He has written several critical works in that language, which show the depth and extent of his attainments in that particular department of philology.

He belongs to the Evangelical party in the Church. He is, indeed, looked on as their leader; and has repeatedly had every species of abuse heaped upon him by the moderate party for the zeal he has manifested on behalf of Evangelical principles.

But though at drawn daggers with the moderate party of his own Church, he at once buries in oblivion all his differences and disputes with them, whenever he comes in collision with the Dissenters, whom he regards as the common foe. He cheerfully co-operates with moderate Churchmen—to whom at other times he cannot bring himself to extend the hand of Christian fellowship—when the progress of Dissent is the thing to be resisted. This may appear the more singular, as on all the leading doctrines of the gospel, he and the Calvin-

istic Dissenters are perfectly agreed together ; while his views of those doctrines which the moderate party in the Church entertain, are the very antipodes of his.

I have said he speaks with some frequency. He generally pits himself against Dr. Phillpotts ; but while no one can deny that the former is a man of talents, every one must see at once the great superiority of the latter. The fact, already alluded to, of the Bishop of London expressing a great deal in a few words necessarily curtails his speeches. A man, who despising prefatory flourishes enters into his subject at once, and closely applies himself to it throughout, cannot, in the nature of things, make long orations.

He usually studies his speeches. I do not, however, suppose that he commits them to memory before delivering them. I never could perceive any traces of this. All I should suppose he does, is to cast the subject over in his mind, planning out the particular course of argument he will adopt. But though thus far preparing his speeches, he is not one of those incapable of extemporaneous speaking. He is often happy in reply : nothing could be more clear or correct than his phraseology, or more apposite than are his arguments, in the majority of such cases.

The great inconsistency in Dr. Blomfield's character as a Christian bishop, is, that he has one rule of conduct for the rich and another for the poor. He is a most zealous advocate for Temperance Societies among the lower classes—and is the President of the London Temperance Society; but he has never sought to extend the principles of these societies to the rich, though, beyond all question, they are as much needed among them as among the poor. Every one of sound religious principles must regret the extent to which the sabbath is desecrated in London: the Bishop of London has strenuously endeavoured to put down the evil; but here, again, his exertions have been partial as respects the parties affected. It is the violation of the Sabbath by the poorer classes only, that he has denounced and endeavoured to prevent: the Cabinet dinners of Ministers—the festive parties and unsanctified amusements of the upper ranks of society, escape his anathemas. He applies not the rod of correction to them even in a gentle manner, though he uses it with an unsparing severity in the case of those who move in a more humble sphere of life.

In his political opinions he is liberal on various important questions; but he can hardly be said to be a partisan. The particular course he will pur-

sue on certain occasions is known to no one beforehand; and, consequently, when rising to address their Lordships in such cases, I have seen the greatest anxiety evinced by noble Lords on both sides of the House, to ascertain what were his sentiments on the subject before it.

DR. MALTBY, late Bishop of Chichester, and now Bishop of Durham, has made himself more conspicuous among his Right. Rev. brethren on the Bench, by the decided liberality of his opinions, than from any prominent part which he takes in the proceedings of the House. The Right Rev. Prelate's liberality is not confined to political questions only; it is equally extended to all matters connected with the Church herself. Not only is he one of the most thorough-going Church Reformers in the House, but he has few equals—always, of course, excepting the Infidel party—even in the country itself. When I mention this fact, no one will be surprised to hear that he is in the worst possible odour with by far the largest portion of the Bench of Bishops. They look on him as a black swan; and some of them have more than once intimated in their places in Parliament, and in the hearing of the Right. Rev. Prelate himself, that they consider him a wolf in sheep's clothing. He, however, takes the matter wonder-

fully easy ; and tells them in plain terms, that, equally regardless of their smiles or their frowns, their love or their hate, he will quietly pursue what appears to him the path of duty. He is a "good easy man." Nothing, indeed, seems to disconcert him, or put him out of countenance. He appears to have an excellent flow of spirits. The smile of good nature almost invariably sits on his countenance : and the prepossessing impression which a first sight of him makes in your mind, is strengthened when you hear him speak. His voice and manner are full of mildness : he does not speak often ; nor can he be considered an effective speaker. His matter wants vigour and depth, and his manner is deficient in energy. What he says is to the point ; but it is never above mediocrity : it is more remarkable for its simplicity than for any other quality. His voice is pleasant, but not strong : it has no flexibility. Of his gesture he is very sparing ; in fact, he makes no pretensions to oratory. He seems to act on the conviction—judging from the fewness of his speeches, and the brevity and unimpassioned character of those he does make—that elaborate orations are very foolish things ; that they never make a single proselyte ; but that, after all, "the vote's the thing." Acting on this principle, he

has said but little either for Earl Grey's Government, by whom he was raised to the Bench, or for that of his successor in office; but his vote has always, on all important occasions, been at the service of both Administrations.

The Right Rev. Prelate is tall and stout, with considerable breadth of shoulders. His face is full without being fat. His features are small and regular. He may be considered a good-looking man. His complexion is something between fair and dark, inclining rather to the former. His head is nearly bald: the little hair he has on it is on the sides, and at the back, and is of a light brown. He does not look so old as he is; he is about his sixtieth year, but you would not think he was much more than fifty.

The BISHOP OF HEREFORD, Earl Grey's brother, was well known to the public during the Administration of the noble Earl; not, certainly, from any speeches he made in the House, or any thing else he had done to bring himself into notice, but because of his near relationship to one whose name during those four years filled so large a space in the nation's eye. The notoriety—I can hardly call it reputation—which the Right Rev. Prelate then enjoyed, from the circumstances I have mentioned, was a good deal increased by his voting

against his brother on several of the most important questions which the Government of the latter brought forward,—though that Government had elevated him to a much higher station than he formerly filled, and added considerably to his means of living. His political opinions are deeply tinged with Toryism; in religion he belongs to the moderate party in the Church. Of the opinions of the Evangelical party he may rather be said to disapprove, than to be hostile to their party itself in the abstract. His countenance gives every indication of a mild and conciliatory disposition, and his conduct confirms the impression which is thus created. He is understood to be full of the milk of human kindness.

I can hardly form an estimate of his talents; for he has not afforded the means by any exhibition he has made in the House. He scarcely ever opens his mouth; and even the few occasions on which I have heard him deliver two or three sentences, the topics have been of very secondary importance. From the little I have heard of his speaking—if this may be called speaking—I should conclude he is not only an indifferent orator, but a man of very limited scope of mind.

He is rather above the middle height, and of a handsome person, considering his advanced years;

for sixty-six summers' suns have shone on his head, the hair of which is light. His face is thin, and his features are strongly marked. They have, blended with the mildness of which I have spoken, an expression of deep thoughtfulness. His complexion is sallow: he is apparently in tolerable health; but his constitution, owing perhaps to his advanced years, seems as if it were incapable of enduring much exertion or fatigue.

I should add, that though his voice is hardly ever to be heard in the House, he is one of the most regular of his Right Rev. brethren in his attendance on his legislative duties.

CHAPTER XVII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

IT is but justice to many noble Lords, whose names have not been mentioned in this work, to state, that in making the selection I have been guided solely by their comparative prominency in the public eye, and not by their usefulness as legislators. It consequently follows, that I have been obliged to devote a part of my space to noble Lords whose abilities are not of an order to entitle them to such notice, while I have been obliged to omit others whose legislative qualifications are such as to claim the respect of their fellow-countrymen.

In the Upper, as in the Lower House, there are members who, through some accidental circumstance, suddenly emerge from the depths of obscurity into a prominent place in the public eye, and then as suddenly fall back again into oblivion. Lord Alvanley is the most remarkable recent instance of this. Before his memorable attack, at the beginning of last Session, on Mr.

O'Connell, the noble Lord's name was hardly ever heard of as a member of the House of Peers. O'Connell as usual returned the blow with redoubled force, applying to him, among other epithets, that of "a bloated buffoon." His Lordship challenged O'Connell to fight; the latter, for well-known reasons, refused; but his son Morgan offered to substitute himself in his place. Lord Alvanley accepted the offer—the parties met and fought; and his Lordship, for the proverbial period of nine days, enjoyed as great a prominence in the public eye as must have satisfied the most craving appetite for distinction. Since then his name has scarcely ever been heard of as a member of the Legislature.

There are many Peers who scarcely ever open their mouths in the Upper House, who were distinguished for their loquacity when members of the Lower House. Earl Spencer is the most remarkable recent instance of this. When Chancellor of the Exchequer, he spoke more frequently perhaps, than any other member; but his elevation to the Peerage seems to have utterly sealed his lips as a senator. Indeed, he now scarcely ever attends to his legislative duties at all. I have not seen him once in his place in the House of Lords during the present Session; and he was not half-a-dozen times in it in the course of all last Session.

Lord Glenelg is pretty much in the same predicament, in so far as speaking is concerned. He has not made any speech worthy of the name since his elevation to the Upper House, and has only broken silence three or four times, and then only for a very short time. In his attendance in the House he is far from regular; but he is certainly not so bad as Earl Spencer.

It is a fact worthy of observation, that with the single exception of Lord Brougham, no man that has, of late years, been raised from the Lower to the Upper House, has made any figure in the latter place. On the contrary, they all seem to be rapidly descending, as public speakers, into obscurity. In addition to earl Spencer and Lord Glenelg, I may mention the names of Lord Denman, Lord Abinger, Lord Ashburton, Lord Hatherton, &c.; in fact, there is something in the very constitution of their Lordships as a body which has a strong tendency to discourage all attempts at oratorical distinction.

THE END.

LONDON:
BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

0







PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

JN	Grant, James
623	Random recollections of
1836	the House of Lords
G82	

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW



D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 12 06 03 04 024 8